NATIONAL WEEKLY

# Social Justice

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

10c

Royal Oak, Michigan | September 22, 1941 | Subscription Three Dollars Per Year

# U. S. WAR MAKERS INVITE AN INCIDENT

(See Page 3)

## Civilian Pilots to Deliver Bombers via Ocean Ferry

(Story on Page 5)

## Read: 'Death at Dakar' —Key Port to Africa

*London Editor Takes Up Fr. Coughlin's Crusade*

COMMENT ON WORLD EVENTS ★ HOW HAS COMMUNISM WORKED IN SOVIET ★ MR. BARUCH 'TAKES A WALK': ROSENMAN STAYS

# Dinner Chat

SOMETIMES we almost wish that we could hold up our issue of SOCIAL JUSTICE for another week, or a few days anyway. That, we suppose, is the result of a lifetime of habit in the newspaper field where five and more editions a day are required to keep up with developments.

At that, we're lucky for a national magazine; most of them require an editorial deadline of 6 to 8 weeks ahead of publication. So our publication "week-ends" are not so bad.

Then, too, we all have our field. The day to day developments in the news, even war news, cannot affect the fundamental principles with which we are concerned — except to confirm them.

Incidentally, we do not like to read the references to SOCIAL JUSTICE as "obstructionist" and "pro-Nazi."

We are pro-Christ and pro-America — almost a lonesome stand, these days, we admit.

We don't believe anyone is confused over our pro-Britishism. But we refused to agree that opposition to "union now with Britain" makes us pro-Hitler.

Why can we not be just pro-America?

Believe it or not—that's what we are. That is why SOCIAL JUSTICE does not have to wait word from Moscow, or Berlin—or London—as to what we will say next.

---

## 'Daily Worker' Smears Our Letters Page

"Coughlin Preaches Desertion From Army," shrieks a main headline in the *Sunday Worker* (Sept. 7), organ of the New York Communists. Perhaps the source of the slander should make denial or comment superfluous.

The headline appears to be based on a distortion of our comment (Aug. 25) which quoted a National Guardsman's letter reporting resentment in some selectee camps which had for a slogan "over the hill in October." SOCIAL JUSTICE, we say, reported the incident as reflecting conditions; certainly nothing in the comment *commended it, or advocated desertion.*

The Communists' paper continued:

"Coughlin hypocritically pleads innocence in his editorial columns to the charges of attempting to destroy the morale of the armed forces. But he fills the letter columns with *purulent material in the form of letters purported to be written by members of the Army and their relatives.*"

So that's it. The Communists are jealous of our mail.

This "purulent material" the New York aliens are talking about are YOUR letters. It seems to us that the attack is not upon SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine so much as it is upon the good Christian American people who care for their country so much that they have the courage to protest political trickery and injustice, even in times of "emergency."

"Purported to be written by members of the Army, etc." That's as much as charging that SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine "fakes" its letter page — a thing no journal of intelligence or respect would even attempt to do.

The chief problem that harasses your editorial staff is how to do justice to our thousands of correspondents by our selection of their most representative letters each week. The volume of this mail, and the merit of the communications, would easily justify four pages a week.

If we were to print even the best of the week's letters all 20 pages of the magazine would not suffice.

And that has been so for the five years of our publication. The editors of the *Communist Daily Worker* simply cannot understand that kind of reader confidence.

No other magazine in America has the reader confidence or reader contact that SOCIAL JUSTICE could boast — if it would.

Perhaps, we have been too modest.

* * *

Don't let those initials fool you. For almost two years now, SOCIAL JUSTICE has protected the contributors to its Letters Page from persecution by the readers of the *Daily Worker.*

Cliques of Communists and other enemies of Christian truth, self-appointed "kleagles" and assorted "nuts," made up a mailing list of SOCIAL JUSTICE Letter writers and pestered them with letters — or, worse, visited them with personal threats and petty persecution. We have explained all this often enough. Everybody knows it.

So the *Worker* thinks we "fake" our letters; rather the *Worker* does not think so at all, it merely wants its readers to believe so.

And that is precisely why Communism will never achieve a positive end. Communists cannot handle facts. Communists must continually lie, even to their own supporters.

As becomes true minions of Darkness, Truth — and Light — is their enemy.

## Vacation's a Luxury Pete Can't Afford

HELLO, FOLKS:

D'ya mind lettin' a poor, shiverin' pup in this mornin'? Dear me — but it's chilly 'n damp, isn't it? These're mornin's a body likes to lie in bed 'n cuddul inta th' ol' blankuts, but when y' have a thing on y'r mind like a artikul y' can't rest. Y' just gotta be up 'n at it bright 'n erly. So that's what I'm doin'. There's no vakashun f'r th' sirkulashun manajer like there is f'r all th' rest uv th' peepul in th' offus.

Dear me, but ev'rybuddy is gettin' around this year. F'r instunce, there was that nice trip Kate Clinton had this Summer — way out West where men'r men, so I hear, although Kate didn't do so well at findin' one f'r herself. But I guess she 'n th' girls who drove out with her had a lot uv fun ennyway, what with goin' t' th' Rodeo 'n seein' all th' gran' sights that c'n only be found out West. Gee, I'd like t' go out there sometime — lots uv space t' run in they tell me.

Well, not t' be outdone, Kate Smith — our Kate Smith — not th' one y' hear singin' 'bout gettin' th' moon over th' mountain 'n singin' that song called *"God Bless America"* that has justa 'bout put th' Nashunal Anthum out uv th' runnin'. F'r tradishun-brakin' this day 'n age takes th' cake, b'leeve you me. Oh, Oh, where was I — talkin' 'bout Katie, wasn't I? It's awful th' way I c'n get from one subjekt onta annuther, isn't it? In fakt, I don't know uv ennyone who c'n beet me.

Well, t' get back t' th' subjekt — th' las' menshuned Kate is vakashunin' way up in Canada — someplace called Regina. I'll bet she'll have an awful time keepin' outta skraps 'bout th' war. I guess up that way they all think it's a might fine thing 'n they don't think much uv us SOCIAL JUSTICE peepul f'r not bein' all out f'r a shootin' war.

Well, from what I gather, they won't hafta wait too long. Th' President is all konvinst t' their way uv thinkin' so I guess they'll soon have us in there doin' th' job f'r 'em again. We'll soon be just one big, unhappy famly, sharin' th' poverty like th' warmongruls want us t' do. Kate is more diplomatik though than than mos' profeshunal diplomats 'n I guess she'll manege t' steer a peeceful corse down th' conversashunal streem.

The Kates don't have a korner on nice vakashuns, it seems. Nosirree. Isn't little Lettie Faber hiein' herself off t' Calafornya t' visut relatives. I hope they don't turn on any o' that "unushul" wether they have down there ev'ry once in a wile, 'n put th' damper on her good time.

Yep, they all c'n have their vakashuns, but th' sirkulashun manajer has t' stay here with his nose t' th' grindstone, as th' sayin' goes. Not only me, but you peepul out in th' feeld — th' good frien's who day in 'n day out 're workin' hard to keep SOCIAL JUSTICE alive — hafta keep on pluggin'.

If I do say so myself, we've done a fine job so far, 'n we c'n feel kinda proud uv ourselves. Speshully those few loyal frien's who are so devoted to our cause that they've prakticully given up all their spare time t' promotin' it.

It calls f'r a lotta sakrafice 'n hard werk 'n we down at this end uv th' line appreshiate it. Maybe sometimes I don't menshun 'em pertikulerly, but jus' th' same, I'm not fergettin'.

Well, I guess I'd better be on my way now. I don't wanta overstay 'n ware out my welkum.

I'll be seein' y' again soon. Til then, take good kare uv yerselves.

S'long, now.

— PETE.

**SUBSCRIPTION COUPON**

Date_____

Name _____

Address _____ City _____

State _____ Subscription rate $3 a year. Renewal ☐ New ☐

**SOCIAL JUSTICE PUBLISHING CO., Royal Oak, Michigan**

**16 PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL JUSTICE**

**Liberty of conscience and education.**

**Just living annual wage.**

**Nationalization of important public resources.**

**Private ownership of all other property.**

**Control of private property for public good.**

**Abolition of Federal Reserve Banking System and establishment of a Government-owned Central Bank.**

**Restoration to Congress of its sole right to coin and regulate the value of money.**

**Cost of living maintained on an even keel.**

**Cost of production plus a fair profit for the farmer.**

**Labor's right to organize.**

**Recall of non-productive bonds.**

**Abolition of tax-exempt bonds.**

**Broadened base of taxation on basis of ownership and capacity to pay.**

**Simplification of Government and lower taxes.**

**Conscription of wealth as well as men in event of war**

**Sanctity of human rights preferred to sanctity of property with Government's chief concern for the poor.**

SOCIAL JUSTICE National Weekly. Copyrighted 1941 by the Social Justice Publishing Company, publication and editorial office, Royal Oak, Michigan. Subscription price United States and possessions, $3.00 per year. Unless otherwise directed all subscriptions begin with the current issue. Three weeks are required to effect change of subscriber's address. Give both old and new addresses. Entered as second class matter, March 12, 1937, at the Post Office, Royal Oak, Michigan, under the Act of March 3, 1879. E. Perrin Schwartz, Editor; Cora Quinlan, Secretary-Treasurer.

SOCIAL JUSTICE is fully protected by copyright and nothing that appears in it may be reprinted either wholly or in part, without special permission. The use of articles or quotations from SOCIAL JUSTICE for digest, advertising, promotions and stock-selling schemes is never authorized.

**Vol. 8 September 22, 1941 No. 12**

# Comment

## Invitation to an Incident

IT'S ALL over but the shooting.

By the time the lines of this comment can be printed that, too, may eventuate.

Mr. Roosevelt, who has been looking for provocative incidents for war ever since 1934, told the world the other night that he had given the United States Navy orders to shoot on sight any German sea raider or submarine anywhere in "the defensive waters of the United States."

Characteristically, his speech did not define this area, though the words "Western Hemisphere" were frequently employed.

Next day, however, State Secretary Hull explained that "defense waters of the United States" are anywhere in the world that our national interest is threatened.

One of the five ship sinkings which, Mr. Roosevelt said, manifest Nazi Germany's programmed line of conduct, occurred in the Red Sea.

It is going to be hard to sell the man on the street—the 80 per cent of Americans against war—the idea that the fabled Red Sea of Bible times is "defense waters" of the United States of America.

True, the waters of the Red Sea opened once to permit the Chosen People to escape from their predicament in Egypt, but it's a poor "out" for the war makers of today.

There is, of course, a considerable section of the people satisfied to be pushed around forever. Their slogan is "Our President knows best."

* * *

"Indeed, we have been *inched to the very edge of a war with Germany* by a whole procession of slogans.

Back in the very beginning of our tampering with neutrality, if you remember, the war makers brought forth the slogan of *"cash and carry."*

Let us make war material for England, they said, and sell it to her for cash on the barrel-head, providing she comes and gets it with her own ships—*"cash and carry."*

SOCIAL JUSTICE, you may also remember, dared to call this kind of neutrality a "phoney." We said this argument was simply the entering wedge for a fuller participation in the European war *that had been already planned.*

"Cash and carry," said both Father Coughlin and SOCIAL JUSTICE, meant "credit and carrion!"

Then, England's declared war against Germany over the occupation of German Danzig, East Prussia and the Versailles-created Corridor, suddenly became a war to defend *"our way of life."*

* * *

Mr. Hitler's "new order" for Germany, he frankly admitted, was copied from the planned economy of Mr. Roosevelt's "New Deal." The difference was that *Hitler made it work*: first in Germany and, then, in increasingly larger contiguous areas of central Europe.

The important thing to note is that Hitler made his "new order" work *first in Germany.*

It is not especially to Hitler's credit that he worked out a goldless economy: the internationalists took the gold away from him, and Germany was forced to its great "discovery."

Nation after nation in Europe — and some in South America—has expressed a preference for a goldless economy based on honest national wealth, rather than the fictitious prosperity of debt bonds based on private gold held by a few internationalists.

In America, the New Deal, attempting to operate with the old international gold crowd in control, could not get to first base with any real reform—reform of the old evils being essential to any recovery.

So, Hitler's "new order" in Europe became a menace to our *"free way of life";* and America, (i.e. gold-debt) as Mr. Roosevelt said the other night, cannot have peace and happiness in the midst of a Nazi-dominated world.

So, the regimentation that is called totalitarian enslavement in Nazi-land, becomes in America, "conscription," "rationing" and "sacrifice for defense."

* * *

Our next slogan was *"all aid for Britain short of war,"* and a "Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies" became very active for a time. Its chief activity appeared to be the promulgation of "union now with Britain."

Soon, "cash and carry" was cashiered for *"lease-lend"* which, SOCIAL JUSTICE said, might have been more honestly stated as "give and deliver."

Then we heard the American President's program of the *"four freedoms everywhere in the world."* Since these freedoms were not particularly manifest at home under the New Deal, the idea was more or less esoteric and it left the rank and file of Americans unimpressed.

All the while the President was looking for an incident — *"Hitler must be destroyed!"*

* * *

The torpedo which a German submarine fired—not very accurately—at the U. S. destroyer *Greer* might as well have had Mr. Roosevelt's name on it!

It gave the President the incident he had been looking for for almost seven years.

*"Freedom of the seas!"*

Now there was a slogan that Americans have thrilled to and rallied around ever since the days of John Paul Jones and Stephen Decatur.

And the President was not loathe to admit that the pressure of precedent compelled him to his historic role.

True to the course laid down for him by John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, etc., etc., it became the duty of the American Navy once more to clean out pirates and "rattlesnakes."

When you see a rattlesnake coiled beside the path, he said, you do not wait for it to strike, you crush him.

German submarines, the President went on, are the "rattlesnakes of the sea," the United States Navy would fire whenever it saw one—and there you are!

Of course, the President also said that we "do not seek a shooting war."

We are simply going to convoy merchant shipping bearing material for the destruction of Hitler anywhere and everywhere in the world.

Germany can avoid war, he intimated, by taking her submarines and sea raiders off the ocean, or withholding their fire when they see an American flag.

Virgino Gayda, the Italian spokesman, said the President leaves axis naval units "no alternative but to fire on U. S. naval vessels on sight."

And so, after a long hunt, we have—almost—our incident.

* * *

Let us not "split hairs," the President enjoined but it seems to this commentator that His Excellency performed something of a hirsute dicotomy of his own.

What about the pressure of precedent set by our great First President, Gen. Wash-

(Continued on Page 4)

### Index to Comment


Invitation to an Incident ..... Page 3

Who Wants War—'British, Jews and Roosevelt' ..... Page 4

Civilians to Deliver Bombers Via Ferry; Pilots Find Big Planes Faulty ..... Page 5

Editorials: If Stalin Crushes Hitler; Still Our Constitution ..... Page 6

London Editor Preaches Christian Social Justice; Bolshevism Emerges ..... Page 7

Mr. Baruch 'Takes a Walk' ..... Page 8

Court Packing 'Alibi'; La Follette Presents Tax Case of Wage Earners ..... Page 9

Death at Dakar—an 'Important' Port ..... Page 10

A 'Key' to the Dakar Mystery; Bankruptcy Bitter Fruit of Usury; More on Usury ..... Page 11

Watch Sir Otto ..... Page 12

Has Communism Worked in Russia? Red Aid Not for the Russian People ..... Page 13

Hollywood Censors Radio Reviewer ..... Page 14

Critic Assists Film Probe ..... Page 15

George Seldes; Note to Committee Investigating Movies ..... Page 19

What Good Results from Two Years of War? ..... Page 20

# Comment

(Continued from Page 3)

ington, against entangling foreign alliances, or a third term presidency?

Or, Andy Jackson's battle with the bankers, so akin to the courageous promise of President Roosevelt to drive out the money changers, back in 1932?

Or, President Lincoln, who went to his death on the very eve of "isolating and identifying" the makers of civil war and the international money racketeers.

It is unfortunate that in an address commanding such a wide audience the American President chose to emphasize relatively minor precedents and ignore the powerful ones.

* * *

No, "*Hitler must be destroyed!*".

Administration spokesmen, seeking "an incident" to justify their great crusade, said as long ago as 1934: "If it's the last thing we ever do we'll crush Germany!"

Truer words were never uttered. Destruction of Hitler and his "new order" in Nazi-dominated Europe will probably be the *last act* of the America we know.

Indeed, the President frankly admitted that without the British Navy America's case already is hopeless.

"It must be explained again and again to people who like to think of the United States Navy as an invincible protection that this can only be true if the British Navy survives."

So, the United States is dependent upon Great Britain.

If Britain were defeated, or if England should make a separate peace with Hitler, the United States is sunk!

Said the President:

"If the world outside the Americas falls under axis domination, the shipbuilding facilities which the axis powers would then possess . . . would be much greater than all the shipbuilding facilities and potentialities of all the Americas—*not only greater but several times greater.*"

Can you imagine the Washington reaction if SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine, or Col. Lindbergh, had said that?

"Even if the United States threw all its resources into such a situation . . . the axis powers . . . would have the man power and the physical resources to outbuild us *several times over.*" The President's words.

That's what we've *been telling them down at the office!*

This admission by the President raises a natural question: Is the difference between parity and "several times over" represented by the facilities of the British Isles? We do not think so.

In other words, if Hitler can outbuild us several times over with England out of the picture, does the President mean us to believe that with England still in, we are now outbuilding Hitler?

Are England's facilities that important?

Is the United States so utterly dependent then for its safety upon the fate of England —upon the whim, if you will, of British politicians?

If so, are we not undertaking a big contract to go out and pick a fight with this axis-dominated world, wherever we can find one of their submarines or raiders in any part of the seven seas; simply because we do not like Hitler.

And, chiefly, because he took the "new deal" which we muffed and made a world success of it.

Ever since that threat by an administration "higher up," back in 1934; ever since the President's bridge dedication speech in Chicago; and long before Hitler became anybody's menace, we have known that the intention was to destroy Nazi Germany.

Invasion of Germany, not merely defense, was "the plan."

The search has been continuous for incidents of provocation—*even if we have to make them.*

Well, then, here is our *invitation to an incident!*

---

**Who Wants War?**

## 'British, Jews, and Roosevelt!'

ONCE AGAIN, in his speech at Des Moines, Col. Lindbergh has dared to isolate and identify the war-makers.

He has the forthright courage, furthermore, to say from a public platform what more and more Americans think and — often — fear to say.

The three major groups pressing the United States toward war, Lindbergh says are "the British, the Jewish and the Roosevelt administration!"

"If you will look back over the record, you will find that those of us who oppose intervention have constantly tried to clarify facts and issues," he said. "We ask you to read what we said last month, last year, and even before the war began.

"Our record is open and clear, and we are proud of it. We have not led you on by subterfuge and propaganda. We have not resorted to 'steps short of' anything, in order to take the American people where they did not want to go. What we said before the elections, we say 'again, and again, and again' today. And we will not tell you tomorrow that it was 'just campaign oratory.'

* * *

"The three most important groups who have been pressing this country toward war are the British, the Jewish, and the Roosevelt administration.

"Behind these groups, but of lesser importance, are a number of capitalists, anglophiles, and intellectuals, who believe that their future, and the future of mankind, depend upon the domination of the British empire.

"Add to these the communistic groups who were opposed to intervention until a few weeks ago, and I believe I have named the major war agitators in this country.

"I am speaking here only of war agitators, not of those sincere but misguided men and women who, confused by misinformation and frightened by propaganda, follow the lead of the war agitators.

* * *

"Let us consider these groups, one at a time.

"First, the British: It is obvious and perfectly understandable, that Great Britain wants the United States in the war on her side. England now is in a desperate position. Her population is not large enough, and her armies are not strong enough, to invade the continent of Europe and win the war she declared against Germany.

"Her geographical position is such that she cannot win the war by the use of aviation alone, regardless of how many planes we send her. Even if America entered the war, it is improbable that the allied armies could invade Europe and overthrow the Axis powers.

"England has devoted, and will continue to devote, every effort to get us into the war. We know that she spent huge sums of money in this country during the last war in order to involve us. Englishmen have written books about the cleverness of its use. We know that England is spending great sums of money for propaganda in America during the present war. If we were Englishmen, we would do the same.

"But our interest is first in America; and, as Americans, it is essential for us to realize the effort that British interests are making to draw us into their war. . . .

* * *

"The second major group I mentioned is the Jewish. It is not difficult to understand why Jewish people desire the overthrow of Nazi Germany. The persecution they suffered in Germany would be sufficient to make bitter enemies of any race.

"No person with a sense of the dignity of mankind can condone the persecution of the Jewish race in Germany. But no person of honesty and vision can look on their pro-war policy here today without seeing the dangers involved in such a policy both for us and for them.

"Instead of agitating for war, the Jewish groups in this country should be opposing it in every possible way, for they will be among the first to feel its consequences.

"A few far-sighted Jewish people realize this, and stand opposed to intervention. But the majority still do not. Their greatest danger to this country lies in their large ownership and influence in our motion pictures, our press, our radio, and our government.

* * *

"The Roosevelt administration is the third powerful group which has been carrying this country toward war.

"The power of the Roosevelt administration depends on the maintenance of a war-time emergency.

"The prestige of the Roosevelt administration depends upon the success of Great Britain to whom the President attached his political future at a time when most people thought that England and France would easily win the war.

(Continued on Page 5)

# Comment

(Continued from Page 4)

"The danger of the Roosevelt administration lies in its subterfuge.

"While its members have promised us peace, they have led us to war, heedless of the platform on which they were elected.

"It is not yet too late to show that no amount of money or propaganda or patronage can force a free and independent people into war against its will.

"I tell you, the last stronghold of democracy and representative government in this country is in our House of Representatives and our Senate. There, we can still make our will known.

"And if we, the American people, do that, independence and freedom will continue to live among us, and *there will be no foreign war.*"

---

## Civilians to Deliver Bombers by Ferry

ANNOUNCEMENT of an "airplane ferry service" to West Africa, and thence to Egypt, is significant.

Under this plan, civilian pilots are to deliver bombers under direction of the Pan American Airways.

Thus, last week, Pan American stretched its lines to within 6,000 miles of encircling the globe.

Civilian pilots will fly the bombers to Brazil, across the South Atlantic to West Africa, and overland to Egypt.

Specifically, the new "ferry service" follows the Pan American's surveyed route, namely: From New York City or Baltimore to San Juan, Puerto Rico; to Port of Spain, Trinidad; to Belem and Natal, Brazil. From Natal the planes will hop 1,800 miles (not quite the span from Newfoundland to Ireland), across the Atlantic to Monrovia, Liberia (Bathurst, Gambia and Freetown British stations, optional).

The pilots will hug the "hump" of African coast as far as Nigeria, then cut across directly to Khartoum and, perhaps eventually, fly to Cairo and maybe even to Russian stations.

Pan American has already planned direction finders, hangars, landing fields, communications, meteorological stations, and relay stations from New York to Cairo.

This South Atlantic ferry system is in addition to the ferry system operated over the North Atlantic from New York to Hattiescamp, Newfoundland, thence to Scotland and Ireland, with emergency landing spots in Greenland and Iceland.

Already there is talk of instituting a further ferry service from Oregon and Washington, by way of Canada to Alaska's new bases, thence across the Bering Sea to Siberia and, finally, overland to Russia.

* * *

To date, the British ferry service from Freetown, Bathurst and Gambia has been inadequate and inefficient.

Norwegian, Polish and Free French pilots attempted to fly American-made planes to destinations in North Africa and Asia Minor; but, unacquainted with the modern fighters and bombers, the loss of planes was alarming.

The R.A.F., ferrying planes from Freetown to Cairo lost 20 per cent of the planes in crash landings. The reported "inefficiency" of the R.A.F. delivery system rivaled the disastrous U.S. air mail *fiasco;* for regular pilots cannot be spared to handle the ferrying, which is similar to commercial flying.

Crates of American planes are still at Bathurst awaiting delivery via ferry service. These planes, and planes in production, will be delivered henceforth by civilian pilots. The ships will carry spare engine parts, extra gas and aeronautical equipment, thus serving as freight ships. Without the bomb and gun load, the planes can carry about three tons of freight.

Czech, French, Polish and Dutch pilots, who formerly ferried the planes from Freetown to Cairo, lost 20 per cent of the planes.

* * *

The British need these new American bombers to protect the oil wells of Iran and the Russian Caucasus from German attack. Since the occupation of Iran, Britain and Russia hope to use Iranian and Iraqi bases for the protection of oil fields toward which the Germans are driving from Ukraine.

American planes will also be used to blast the Germans out of Libya, and to deliver attacks on Sicily, reputedly the base for Nazi and Fascist air and sea raiders operating in the Mediterranean.

Furthermore, the big American bombers will be used as convoys for supply ships passing through the eastern Mediterranean and Black Sea enroute to Russia. At present, these sea lanes are effectively blocked by Nazi airmen based in Sicily, Crete and along the Grecian coast.

No doubt, American civilian airmen will encounter armed opposition while ferrying planes from Monrovia through enemy territory to Khartoum. From Khartoum to Iranian ports, the American pilots will fly over supposedly neutral territory.

The plane ferry system was, presumably, another of the momentous decisions arrived at during the Roosevelt-Churchill secret conference.

Thus, Soviet Russia will be supplied by two routes: one the South Atlantic-Africa route; and the other, the Alaskan-Siberian overland route.

---

## Test Pilots Find Big Planes Faulty

OFFICIAL red tape, stupidity or bull headedness may result in the needless deaths of many pilots assigned to fly three new types of light and medium bombers being produced for the United States army air corps.

That, in substance, is the charge made recently by Wayne Thomis, aviation editor of the *Chicago Tribune*, after interviewing civilian pilots who have tested the craft and found them extremely dangerous to land.

Coincidentally the Associated Press, a few days following the *Tribune* disclosure, reported from Washington that Army air officers acknowledged there would "probably be a number of airplane fatalities" during the September maneuvers in Louisiana.

Quoting test pilots who declined to be identified for fear of official reprisals, Thomis said the landing speed of the new ships was much too high and that crashes would be inevitable. It would be almost impossible to land the planes safely at night under any but the most ideal conditions, he said.

Army officers and engineers realize the gravity of the situation but are helpless to remedy it because Washington officialdom refuses to halt production of the deficient planes, Mr. Thomis wrote.

He quoted one pilot as follows: "We decided to tell the story of these bombers to the public for only one reason. And that is because *we have gotten nowhere by telling it to air corps representatives.*

"We've made our reports on these airplanes to the War Department. The Army officers in charge of production and engineering know what is wrong. But they can't seem to get it understood in Washington and get the production lines halted. And until someone in Washington acts, the factories go right on turning out more and more of these airplanes.

"All of us have only one object — to see the United States with the best and biggest air force in the world. But we know better than any one else that unless airplanes for that air force *are usable ships* the country cannot be adequately defended. The present types are not usable."

* * *

The chief complaint is that the high "approach" speed of 135 miles an hour and the landing speeds of 90, 115 and 120 miles an hour respectively of the three types of ships require paved runways of about 4,500 feet in length. On unpaved runways or small, rough areas the planes would be unable to take off or land.

"Currently," Thomis said, "the Army is not attempting to fly either type of ship other than in daylight with excellent weather."

Despite this, the aviation editor says, there have been scores of crashes.

The ships in question weigh from 22,000 to 28,000 pounds and are capable of about 350 miles an hour.

In contrast with their high approach and landing speeds, Thomis pointed out, the 300-mile-an-hour German Heinkel 111Ks and the Ju-88s land at 75 miles an hour, although they weigh about 30,000 pounds. Both British and German high-speed fighter planes land at 70 to 75 miles an hour. And huge new four-motored bombers being built for the U.S. Army by the Boeing and the Consolidated aircraft factories land at 65 and 70 miles an hour. Nevertheless they are capable of more than 300 miles an hour air speed.

The Associated Press story announcing the air officers' expectations of fatalities might possibly have been given out to "soften the shock" in case these deficient airplanes are used in night maneuvers under simulated war conditions.

Accidents and deaths are inevitable in war games involving tens of thousands of raw recruits and unseasoned pilots. But if Army flyers are killed in crashes of planes condemned by the civilian test pilots, that is wanton destruction and disregard for life on the part of somebody in authority. Moreover, it approaches *sabotage* of our national defense.

NATIONAL WEEKLY

**Social Justice**

Published by The Social Justice Publishing Co.

*Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin*

# If Stalin Crushes Hitler

COMMUNISM in America never got very far from the soapbox stage, or the philosophy of the academic theorists, because Americans, instinctively, dislike long-haired men and short-haired women.

But we put up with their nonsense so long as their only weapons were words and their worst offense was subversion.

As long as the American nation, and the rest of the world, held Communism in contempt, and regarded it as a sort of parasite on the body politic, it recruited its devotees spasmodically and did not cull men of action or devotion or true courage.

Communists, all over the world, lived like human rats—in the cellars and walls of other people's houses.

But, if the Russians can stop the greatest military machine of modern times, the Red army will certainly move on to world conquest and world revolution.

* * *

England hopes that the Russian victory will wear Hitler out, and cause his Nazi military machine to disintegrate; but that the conflict will leave on the bloody steppes of Russia a broken Red army which can never offend anybody.

And England wants this not because she hates Germany any less, but because she fears Soviet Russia more.

If England attempts any expedition to help Soviet Russia, Americans may rest assured that it will reach in from the Arctic or up from Iran; for England wants an arrow pointed at the heart of Russia to insure good behavior in the event of a German collapse.

To allow a British army to fight beside the Soviet armies without a path open to the sea and the British navy would be the worst kind of strategy.

Britain does not want to "sow the wind" and reap the proverbial whirlwind.

Soviet Russia has more men, more resources, a better strategic position, and just as despotic and fantastic a dictatorial government as Nazi Germany's.

Some people think that Sovietism is far worse than Naziism; and they have cogent reasons to back their position. Christians, particularly.

No nation, or combination of nations, can hold Stalin if he ever succeeded in smashing Hitler.

One country that the Soviet has already selected for a terrible revenge is Franco's Spain. Soviet Russia would be willing to sack the whole of Europe to get at Christian Catholic Spain.

An "ideal" solution, therefore, according to England's view, would be a war of stalemate, with the Nazi and Soviet armies locked in a death struggle until both are exhausted; followed by revolutions in both countries to replace the murderous regimes now in power both in Russia and Germany.

* * *

In order to "destroy Hitler," it is estimated conservatively that Great Britain and America would have to put twice as many divisions into the field as Hitler now has. That is, 520 divisions must be trained, equipped, and supplied at least as well, if not better, than Hitler trains, equips and supplies his Nazi legions.

The British can release 100 divisions for the invasion. This means that *the United States will have to furnish 420 divisions!*

England and the British Isles would, of course, have to be defended, but the vast continent of North America would be left completely undefended.

The United States would have to transport these "go-get-Hitler legions" 3,000 miles to some strategic invasion point, presumably England.

We must then keep these men supplied with all manner of weapons, munitions, food, clothing, etc. from America while also aiding England and Soviet Russia to maintain their supply lines and keep up the war on other fronts.

And even though the magic of America's New Deal efficiency succeeded in solving these great problems, it is not altogether certain that America then could defeat the Nazis in Germany.

It is much more likely that both Americans and British would suffer one or more "super-Dunkerques."

And the Atlantic ocean is a trifle wider, and harder to evacuate large forces across, than was the English Channel at the time of the Churchill retreat.

# Still Our 'Constitution'

IF THE Supreme Court can be packed to suit the wishes of an Administration, what need have we of a *Constitution?*

What is the significance of a *Bill of Rights?*

"It is not as if the *Constitution* were a dead letter, fixed and unchangeable," writes Thomas F. Woodlock, a columnist in the *Wall Street Journal,* commenting upon Mr. Roosevelt's articles in *Collier's.*

"It can be changed whenever the people want to change it; its own terms prescribe the method for doing it. It has been changed nearly a dozen times and has already a score of *Amendments.* The latest amendment was passed in a year.

"Upon the *Constitution,* as interpreted by the Supreme Court depends every personal right that the citizen enjoys. It is the sole rampart of his liberty.

"The court-packing proposal struck directly at the Court, through the Court at the *Constitution,* and through both at that rampart.

"The spectacle of members of the bar, even professors in schools of law, advocating the packing scheme in open hearing before the Committees of Congress," says Mr. Woodlock, "demonstrated the damage that has been done in our schools by that philosophy (John Dewey's "instrumentalism") to the last generation of students.

"To all appearance the damage is growing steadily," the *Journal* writer warns.

"Some day it will come home to us with a shock and, apparently, we must wait for a shock to open our eyes to it."

---

A READER of SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine relates his experience: It seems he addressed a letter to the President, rather impertinently, to the "Bunk" House, Washington, D. C. As he might have expected, he was called to his local F.B.I. office.

"You look intelligent; you've got a good business; is this your first mental lapse?" he was asked.

The citizen, an indigenous American of the 1776 brand, said something about the *Constitution.*

"Listen, buddy, the Administration's plans are made and they don't intend to have them interfered with by any blank blank taxpayers. Is that clear?"

It was.

**For a 'New Order'**

# London Editor Preaches Christian Social Charter

WE ARE now "rapidly moving away from the liberal era when it was considered in the worst taste to profess in public any positive, let alone religious, ideal, and into an era of essentially religious warfare wherein men will be distinguished and honored for publicly proclaiming their allegiance to God or the latest incarnation of the devil."

The courageous editor of the London *Catholic Herald*, Dr. Michael de la Bedoyere, is calling the attention of wartime England to the great "Christian social charter" of Leo XIII, which Father Coughlin, the Radio Priest, preached in America for over 12 years and which SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine has stressed over the five years of its existence.

Indeed, it was to preach the social encyclicals — and a "new order" of Christian social justice — that this National Magazine was founded by Father Coughlin.

Since all that the English editors know about Father Coughlin is what their American correspondents have reported to them, the *Catholic Herald* has frequently misunderstood and sometimes criticized the now silent Radio Priest.

It is most heartening, therefore, to see this representative Catholic editorial voice in London taking up the social charter of *"Rerum Novarum"* and saying boldly the same things that Father Coughlin dared to say for so many years in America.

It is the more commendable because of the powerful opposition which this Christian attitude is bound to antagonize in wartime Britain.

"Today we can see clearly that the weakness of the liberal democratic State consisted precisely in its inability to control the really important forces that were at work, the forces of organized labor on the one side and the forces of organized capital on the other," says the London editor.

"In other words, the State was squashed between two great economic powers, fighting one another, and both desperately trying to obtain control of the legal and administrative machinery of the State for their own purposes.

"Between the workers' international and the capitalist international the liberal State fought a losing battle and lost its power of protecting the essential rights and liberties of its citizens. Both rival powers were essentially dictatorships, trying to get their way by pressure of force, by bludgeoning, by blackmail, by cunning.

* * *

"If the encyclical had been up to date in 1891 it would have sided with the workers' international, and it would have committed itself to a one-sided and essentially evil cause that was soon destined to reveal its true self. For it is of the prolonged conflict between labor and capital within the democratic State that Hitlerism and Fascism have been born.

"Some people would say that Fascism and Hitlerism mark the triumph of capitalism, while Bolshevism marks the triumph of labor. I personally do not think that is the case with Fascism and Hitlerism, for these, I think, have been unsuccessful attempts to solve this conflict; but I do think that Bolshevism expresses the inevitable character of a State built on the triumph of the labor or Socialist principles behind the class war.

"Lenin attempted to build a modern society in terms of the machine. Marxism essentially involves the idea that the workers must possess the instruments of production, that the workers, instead of being the slaves of economic laws operating in favor of the capitalists, must become part of a collective will which can dominate these laws and use them in the workers' interests.

"In order to do this, it is necessary to promote certain workers to represent their fellows in order to run the machine and to run the new State which supervises the running of the machine. But the moment you do this you are in danger of setting up a new capitalist class and starting the old struggle all over again.

"The only way to avoid this is the way which Lenin tried: it is to make the machine itself the master and all men its servants. And that is exactly what was done in Russia. The aim of the Bolsheviks was to run a vast economic machine in terms of abstract calculation and economic laws put into operation by men and women divested of all personal qualities and merged into an impersonal mass.

"That is why Bolshevism had to destroy religion, the family, the private home, personal education, marriage, individuality, sentiment, romance in art, in music, in the theater.

"But this de-personalizing of man could never succeed, and the Soviet today has been forced back into a State not essentially distinguished from that National-Socialist experiment wherein the conflict between capital and labor is temporarily solved by the secret police.

*"The Workers' Charter* is no milk-and-water version of *The Communist Manifesto.* It glories in being in clean contradiction to the out-of-date and vain Socialist experiment . . .

"Irresponsible individualist capitalism is simply the power of money in the hands of individuals acting through the fog of great companies, great trusts, great banks, all linked together in mutual defense.

"Money *and the power of creating money or controlling the money of others* enable an irresponsible person first to control the economic conditions of the lives of millions anywhere on the globe, and secondly, to control the minds and characters of millions by setting up agencies, such as the press and other intruments of propaganda.

"In one way or another they can come near controlling the State itself."

Now that, we repeat, is powerful editorial language for wartime London!

The *Herald* editor concludes:

"The moment you get outside the military forces, there is comparative chaos . . .

"This perhaps will serve to give some kind of idea of the revolutionary implications of the principles and the order for which *'Rerum Novarum'* stands, for this document really comes to this.

"It demands a social order, so well conceived, so disciplined, so practical, that under it the human person as such may be assured of those basic human and economic rights which are essential if he is to have a chance of living a full life.

"It demands an order at once so free and flexible as well as so disciplined and ruthless as to allow and enforce all that is needed for the full development of the human person in terms of God's unchanging moral law . . .

"There is an absolutely sufficient program in the social encyclicals for our purpose, and I believe there is rapidly growing a sufficiently marked return to the basic moral teaching of the Gospels and Christianity to furnish the atmosphere *in which this social program can be made of the first political importance in the country.*

"What is needed is the spread of the knowledge of this program and these principles.

"What is needed is the prayer and discipline which shall make us, and above all, our leaders, fanatics for the cause.

"And in our case there can only be one sort of fanaticism: the fanaticism of the saint!"

---

## Bolshevism Emerges

THE renewed activity of Communist agents in this country since the Government's promulgation of its policy of all-out aid for Soviet Russia, is alarming, says the Catholic weekly, *America.*

In our larger cities the newsstands are once more laden with Communist papers, pamphlets and books, and Communist speakers are again holding open-air meetings on our street corners.

"When Hitler and Stalin pooled their murderous forces," the editorial points out, "Communism sought cover, and those who could not escape sought refuge in the usual denial of party membership or party sympathy.

"The scene has changed, and the Bolsheviki are now provided with an opportunity beyond their fondest hopes, to flaunt their anti-American and anti-Christian tenets.

"As Catholics and as Americans, we have expressed our condemnation of the policy of all possible aid for Russia.

"We believe with Pius XI, that when the Communist leaders profess to be 'the most zealous promoters and propagandists in the movement for world peace,' they do not put aside their 'trickery,' or renounce their custom of stirring up 'a class warfare which causes rivers of blood to flow.' (Encyclical 'On Atheistic Communism.')

* * *

"We have no doubt that Stalin will promise to behave in a somewhat civilized manner," continues *America,* "and we also have no doubt that he will follow his principle of breaking his promise, as he sees fit, to revert once more to barbarism.

"It would be quite impossible to pick out from all the world an associate more degraded than Stalin, or a doctrine more opposed to Christianity and to the American way of life than the Communism of which he is the chief exponent.

"For this reason, it is today more necessary than at any time since the rise of Stalin's infamous government to be on our guard against the wiles and trickery of Communist agents and agencies . . .

"The fact that we are now committed to a Government policy of aid to the Soviet Republics changes in no whit the Pontiff's condemnation of Communism as 'intrinsically wrong.' "

# Comment

## Mr. Baruch 'Takes a Walk'

BERNARD M. BARUCH, one of President Roosevelt's leading advisors — and head of all American production in the World War Industries Board — strode out of the White House the other day and told newspaper reporters "more than they had heard from him in a long time!"

If what he told the press was any reflection of what was said in the conference he had just left, it was plenty!

Inside, with the President, stayed Judge Samuel Irving Rosenman, whom Mr. Roosevelt calls "Sammy, the Rose."

Wilmott Ragsdale, staff correspondent of the *Wall Street Journal*, reported:

"Mr. Baruch is usually pleasant and talkative when leaving the White House, but seldom if ever has he been as specific in his objections to Administration plans as he was yesterday. Reporters wrote fast as he talked . . .

"The impression that Mr. Baruch was concealing his indignation was borne out when he revealed that he would tell the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in about two weeks what he thinks of the *Price Control Bill.*

" 'I am going to kick the everlasting life out of it!' he said . . .

"Mr. Baruch repeated several times that he was not criticizing anybody, but his criticism of production was incisive.

" 'The Germans said they consciously followed the American plan for industrial mobilization,' he said, 'and they improved on it. But don't forget, we wrote the book — America wrote the book, not Baruch.

" 'Labor and industry can chew at each other as they must,' he continued, 'but don't forget that American industry and workmen are the best in the world. All we've got to do is *get them going!*'

"Asked whether they were 'going' yet, Mr. Baruch retorted emphatically 'NO!'

" 'Just get our production headed right and we'll knock hell out of 'em! But all problems can't go to that one man,' he said.

"He referred to Mr. Roosevelt.

"Asked what obstacle there was to creation of a one-man set-up, Mr. Baruch answered quizzically: *'That question makes me laugh!'*

" 'Well, it's been storing up here for 18 months,' the lanky statesman-financier laughed. 'Go ahead and get me in trouble!' "

* * *

Baruch, wrote Paul Mallon, "is not only mad because the President didn't adopt his plan for a single control of the defense program. He is bitterly offended because Roosevelt called in Judge Rosenman, the President's very old friend and adviser, and adopted Rosenman's plan without consulting Baruch until afterward.

"This, as much as anything, caused Baruch to make his unorthodox statement on the White House steps . . .

"Rosenman, at the White House at the time, was equally if not more angry at Baruch for disclosing what he discussed with the President.

"This feud will not be healed for a long time."

Thus, while these Princes of Judah battle it out on the White House steps, the President of the United States — and the people — are in the middle!

* * *

While defense was the immediate bone of contention, other facets were in view, notably: (1) the political picture for 1942 and 1944; (2) the long-range plans and social accomplishments of the New Deal; and (3) the anti-Semitic angle.

President Roosevelt, we repeat, was "in the middle" — torn between two advisors. There was "Sammy, the Rose," the theorist of fine judicial mind, cautious; and "Barney" Baruch, a man of action, of practical experience, bold in getting things done.

Mr. Roosevelt backed the theorist, and will live to rue the day when he disregarded the "voice of experience."

For the last 18 months, Mr. Baruch has pleaded for a one-man leadership in the defense set-up. The closest President Roosevelt had come to this was when he set up the two-headed co-ordination of Knudsen and Hillman, at the head of the O.P.M.

When this proved ineffective, he turned to a seven-headed hydra-monster, with Vice President Wallace as ostensible chairman, and this was still worse.

The nation's defense program, as everybody knows, is nowhere near high gear; and its divided and sub-divided authority is only piling confusion on confusion.

Any practical-minded man knows that all the problem details simply cannot go through the bottleneck of the President's personal desk, and be handled efficiently.

Nevertheless, the President insists upon this course. Why?

* * *

First of all, the President does not want a centralized "authority" *for political reasons.*

He desires to retain control in his own hands.

Moreover, he knows that any "defense czar" who makes good would immediately become an outstanding candidate for the Presidency in 1944. Mr. Roosevelt wants to be in a position to dictate the choice; and it looks very much as though he were grooming Vice President Henry Wallace for the job.

A second political angle is Congress. The Administration has not recovered from that 203-202 vote on the draft extension.

The ultimate objective is to bring Congress under the control of the Executive completely.

Over the last eight years, Congress has been shorn of one prerogative after another, even to the power of the purse. Yet, the people's Representatives are still in a position to nullify pet New Deal aims when sufficiently aroused and backed up by the people — as evidenced by the draft extension vote.

* * *

"Sammy, the Rose," as counsellor to Mr. Roosevelt since the latter was Governor of New York in 1929, has succeeded the late Louis Howe as White House political advisor.

Judge Rosenman is credited with the Supreme Court *coup* of 1937. His handiwork is evident in a recent series of articles in *Collier's Magazine*, written in the personal name of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. These articles are most enlightening for they reflect on the "how" and "why" of the Supreme Court fight.

A further reason why the President is said to back Rosenman is because the Judge has also sold the President on the fallacy that business is lying in wait like a black panther to pounce upon all the New Deal's social gains and scuttle them.

Mr. Roosevelt knows that no New Dealer — like Harry Hopkins, or Leon Henderson — can handle the defense setup as a one-man czar.

The mutual distrust between business and the New Deal is reason enough why Mr. Roosevelt will not appoint a business man as No. 1 Defense Head; and he has no New Dealer competent to fill the bill.

* * *

Last, but by no means least, we have the anti-Semitic angle, and the fact that Baruch and Rosenman represent two schools of thought in this direction.

Baruch, a financier, has more or less adhered to the Bank of England's motto: "The dogs bark, but the caravan marches on!"

Judge Rosenman, reportedly, is counselled by Arthur Hayes Sulzberger, publisher of the *New York Times*, who as a publisher familiar with reader reactions, weighs every move lest its reaction boomerang against the Jews.

Sulzberger knows how this volcano is seething in New York City and, though his newspaper has played down and censored a lot of anti-Jewish news material, he knows it is there. His plan is a defense board with Gentile "fronts," and with "big Jews" pulling the strings from behind these scenes. It lessens efficiency, of course, but it is "safer."

*Ad rem* to this consideration we quote the following comment printed in the *Detroit Jewish Chronicle* (Sept. 5, 1941):

"Once in a while a newspaper will 'overlook' a story because it does not fit in with its policy. It took the *New York Times*, which has the biggest news bureau in Washington, a whole week to discover that Justice Samuel I. Rosenman, who has collaborated on the President's most important public addresses, was in the nation's Capital trying to unscramble the defense omelet known as O.P.A.C.S. and O.P.M.

"The *Times* was napping on purpose *because its publisher, Arthur Hayes Sulzberger, doesn't like to see Jews propelled into the spotlight of public life.*

"Remember the feverish days before the President's speech which marked the beginning of the unlimited emergency? Well, Mr. Sulzberger was consulting with F.D.R. at the time, but you could not find mention of that fact in his paper.

"The solid, chunky Justice Rosenman, whom you could always find in the lobby of the Harmonie Club, has now become a man of mystery and *his biography is as scarce as a swastika in Moscow!*"

Close quote, the *Detroit Jewish Chronicle!*

# Comment

## Court Pack 'Alibi'

THE Supreme Court article in *Collier's Magazine*, ostensibly written by President Roosevelt and entitled *"The Fight Goes On,"* follows the planned line of throwing a bone to the people to distract their attention, while "the planners" inch their subversive way toward other secret objectives.

This New Deal is a long-range business. The war is only one incident in it.

The "planners" — like Judge Rosenman — sometimes feel that they can sacrifice a little efficiency in our national defense, in order to make surer their control of the New Deal's regimentation in the post-war era.

Men of action and long experience — like Mr. Baruch — demand results now. They know that long-range planning is a delicate business in the midst of the crises of wartime.

The New Dealers are running defense and war policy, but there is always a chance that these men of action may accept the cried-up emergency as genuine and take over the reins.

Some of us are looking for something like that to happen.

* * *

Commenting on the *Collier's* article, Mr. David Lawrence, an observer of long experience in wartime Washington, comments in his syndicated column:

"Mr. Roosevelt justifies his strange conception of the Executive office by the expression of a fear that if he had not done what he did, *America might have lost her present form of government through seizure of power, as under some alien forms of government.*

"The President's exact words are important to reproduce:

" 'For this was the year (1937) which was to determine whether the kind of government which the people had voted for in 1932, 1934, and 1936 was to be permitted by the Supreme Court to function. If it had not been permitted to function as a democracy, it is my reasoned opinion that there would have been great danger that it might have been ultimately compelled to give way to some alien type of government — in the vain hope that the new form of government might be able to give the average men and women the protection and co-operative assistance which they had the right to expect.'

"Aside from the fact that the American people never had a chance to vote in 1932 or 1934 or 1936 on the issue of tampering with judicial decisions by threatening and intimidating judges on the bench, and not a word about the Supreme Court issue being mentioned in any of these three campaigns, the fact remains that Mr. Roosevelt feels he was justified in breaking down the independence of the Judiciary because of a fancied fear of ultimate dictatorship."

And the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* says boldly:

"Mr. Roosevelt claims too much when he says in effect that the Court bill, even though it failed to pass, eliminated the possible adoption by the United States of an 'alien form of government.'

"It is going pretty far to say that our system was saved by a measure which was designed to break down the historic plan of democratic checks and balances with three separate branches of the Federal Government — the Executive, the Legislative and the Judicial.

"In fact," concludes the St. Louis editorial, "it is going so far that the statement is little more than mere balderdash!"

And, thus, another "orthodox" source takes issue with Justice Rosenman.

If Mr. Roosevelt was sold on the idea — or deceived into believing — that there would be a revolution if he did not pack the Supreme Court with political stooges of the sort he has since appointed — suppose the same person — or *group* — now sells the President on the idea that Congress must go, or we will have an old-fashioned 1776 Republic!

**War Taxes Hit You**

## La Follette Presents Case of Wage Earner

THE JUGGERNAUT of oppressive taxation has already begun to roll over the prostrate form of the American taxpayer.

This is the inevitable result of the insistence upon embroiling the United States in Europe's perennial wars, and promising to finance all those who take up arms against Nazi Germany.

By a vote of 67 to 5 the largest tax bill in the nation's history was approved by the Senate and sent to joint conference between Senate and House representatives for final adoption.

The only opposing votes were cast by isolationist Senators Clark of Idaho, McCarran of Nevada, Nye of North Dakota, Langer of North Dakota and La Follette of Wisconsin.

Specifically, the bill provides for increased taxes of approximately $3½-billion to be superimposed on the present estimated yield of $10-billion, making a total of about $13½-billion to be paid by American taxpayers for the current fiscal year.

As SOCIAL JUSTICE observed last week, the measure is grossly unfair because it places a disproportionate burden of taxation on the small wage earner, increasing his already heavy share of governmental expense while permitting certain wealthy corporation groups to escape lightly.

For example, it imposes a uniform "use" tax of $5 on every automobile owner, whether he be a $20 a week clerk driving a Model A Ford, or a millionaire with a $5,000 limousine. It will extract about $49-million from more than 2¼-million low-wage earners.

It reduces income tax exemptions for single persons from $800 to $750 and for married persons from $2,000 to $1,500. Until last year the exemptions were $1,000 and $2,500.

It increases the rate on taxable income in every income group, but in doing so takes more, proportionately, from the man who is least able to pay.

Defeated were proposals for a 10 per cent tax on corporations whose profits are not large enough to bring them under the excess-profits provision of the present law and for reducing the real estate tax exemption from $40,000 to $25,000.

An amendment *reducing the tax on slot machines* from $200 to $50 was approved.

Previously, amendments for taxing radio chains, soft drink manufacturers and producers of strategic war metals were beaten.

* * *

"When the people of this country find out what kind of a tax bill you have imposed," La Follette warned the Senate, "you're going to hear from them.

"And when they realize what you have done to them, I fear for the future of the country!"

The Senator from Wisconsin fought the bill bitterly, asserting that it was a continuation and expansion of the unfair tax structure which encourages concentration of wealth by a few at the expense of lowering the standard of living for the mass of Americans.

"Already," he said, "due to the increase in excise taxes and sales taxes, which are ultimately paid by the consumer, and which have no relation to ability to pay, we have dipped into the pockets of the low-income groups in this country by asking them to contribute additional sums of money to the support of the activities of the Federal Government, including national defense.

Manufacturers' excise taxes and sales taxes are not taxes on industry, the Senator pointed out, but on the consumer — the wage earner.

"Let no one have any delusions on that point," he said. "The manufacturers' excise tax is passed on to the ultimate consumer. The testimony given before the committee is replete with such evidence. The direct sales tax imposed by this bill obviously will be paid by the ultimate consumer.

"I repeat that such taxes are regressive in their nature. They are *not predicated upon any principle of ability to pay*. They violate that principle for the obvious reason that persons in the lower income groups must spend a larger percentage of their incomes to maintain families and to support life itself, while those in the higher income groups pay out a lesser percentage of their total incomes for the commodities on which the manufacturers' excise and retail sales taxes are levied."

The Senator quoted statistics from a report of the Temporary National Economic Committee showing that persons with incomes under $500 a year pay 21.9 per cent of that meager income in taxes. These include all taxes — Federal, state and local, the figure being based on the tax structure of 1939.

Persons with incomes from $500 to $1,000 pay 18 per cent in taxes, and those having incomes from $3,000 to $5,000 pay 17.6, he said.

Only in the very highest income brackets does the percentage of tax exceed the 21.9 per cent paid by the lowest group.

"So, it cannot be said that we are simply asking for $40.70 from a married man with no dependents," La Follette continued. "We are asking for that amount *on top of all the Federal, state and local taxes which he is now paying*, a burden which is more than $356 on a $2,000 income, according to the T.N.E.C. report."

* * *

La Follette then pointed out the enormous *percentage* increase of tax provided for in the measure for persons in lower income groups.

(Continued on Page 18)

**Behind the War**

# Death at Dakar– An 'Important' Port

INTERVENTIONISTS in Washington, D. C., have long continued to urge that American, British and Free French troops must be sent to "capture Dakar" and to keep this West African port intact from Nazi or Fascist occupation.

Persistent rumors circulate in official Washington, and in the capitals of Europe, that American naval units already are in Monrovia, Liberia, for operations against Dakar.

An American-Liberian *accord*, signed in 1939, permits the United States to send troops to Liberia and to occupy strategic positions in order to "protect Liberia's independence and sovereignty."

But there is, of course, a lot more to the story than that.

* * *

Since the fall of France, German and Italian aeronautical experts have been working at Dakar erecting hangars and creating air bases. Axis planes flying from these bases are supposed to operate against British naval bases on the African coast.

However, British naval units based at African ports and regular naval stations, are continuing to convoy American ships engaged in the Red Sea service. British troops in North Africa are receiving supplies over this route.

The Axis' nearest port and base for attack against these convoys is Dakar. As soon as France fell, the Germans and Italians rushed to Dakar; primarily, to prevent it falling into British hands, and second, to establish Axis bases.

Dakar in British and Free French hands would be far more dangerous to the Axis nations than Dakar, in the hands of the Axis, would be to the British and French operating in North Africa. But there is more to the story than that.

The British, naturally, want Dakar to protect the convoy route and to use it as a base of operations against naval and air bases still in the hands of the Vichy forces.

Now the situation of Dakar demands that, to invade it and occupy it, America must transport food and supplies over the southern route to Europe, and then down the coast to Africa or over the South Atlantic following the trade route from Natal, Brazil, to Dakar, Africa.

Such a trip would demand an ocean voyage of thousands of miles open to attack from Nazi sea raiders.

Free French forces now in North Africa would be forced to operate over thousands of miles of desert to attack Dakar by land.

British forces would have to be transferred thousands of miles overland from present battlefronts in North Africa, or from British and other empire ports.

Operations by land and sea confront innumerable difficulties. Troops attacking the port of Dakar from the sea would have to force a landing against the forts of Dakar blazing death and destruction.

Armies operating against Dakar from land would have to force a passage of thousands of miles through hostile country and desert.

In the meantime, the evacuation of British and Free French forces from North African and Asiatic battlegrounds would imperil the Suez, the British oil line and recent British gains in Asia Minor and Africa.

* * *

The British and Free French remember the disastrous battle of Dakar which resulted in such a complete rout of the attackers.

While De Gaulle planned the attack with the British admiralty high command, word leaked out to Axis agents in England that an attack on Dakar was planned. Immediately, the German General Staff prepared to resist the invasion.

De Gaullist sympathizers in Dakar were jailed, and the "fifth column" on which the British and French relied was ruthlessly destroyed.

As soon as the joint British and French invasion fleet appeared off Dakar a "passive resistance" set in. In the beginning not a shot was fired.

De Gaulle had figured that the suddenness of the appearance of the British and Free French forces, and the concomitant operation of De Gaullist sympathizers within the city, would result in a prompt surrender of the port.

De Gaulle began to land his forces of occupation under the shield of a white flag.

Then he learned that the city would not be surrendered but that the occupants intended to defend it. The battle opened with French and British ships sending shells into the city, as a barrage covered the landing parties.

Guns of the Dakar fortress belched a return fire, hitting British and French men-of-war. The landing forces were repelled with great losses.

The Dakar *fiasco* resulted in a disastrous withdrawal almost as terrible as that at Dunkerque and Crete.

Churchill, who had backed De Gaulle's plans to seize Dakar, was forced to "explain" to Parliament this new defeat in a monotonous series of defeats.

Military strategists admitted that Dakar was impregnable from the sea and that the only possibility of seizing the port would have to be by the co-ordinated operation of sea and land forces which would attack the city and port simultaneously.

* * *

Ever since De Gaulle's unsuccessful invasion attempt, German and Italian engineers, technicians and army men have improved the fortifications. The forts which repelled the joint invasion force have now been equipped with still heavier guns.

Furthermore, Nazi and Fascist airplanes are now based at Dakar's newly constructed air fields and stations.

British intelligence agents have reported that Nazi aeronautical experts have massed planes of all types at Dakar.

Americans are supposed to regard Dakar as the stepping off place in Africa for Nazi and Fascist "attack" on South America and, indirectly, against North America.

Although commercial airlines operated between Natal and Dakar in peacetime, this fact is no proof that fleets of Axis planes could fly from Dakar to Natal for any airborne "invasion" of South America.

Planes fly between America and Lisbon, and between Canada and Scotland; but only the wildest of Col. Lindbergh's critics would assert that Canadians and Americans could hope to launch an effective invasion of Europe by air.

The fear mongers never explain how Germany and Italy can amass troops and supplies at Dakar. As a matter of fact there are no Nazi or Fascist troops there; because the Vichy government refuses to surrender Dakar to the protective custody of the Axis conquerors.

Vichy-French forces defended Dakar against the Churchill-De Gaulle invasion—not Germans and Italians.

* * *

Even if Vichy surrendered Dakar to Italians and Germans, the Axis nations would face insufferable difficulties in transporting troops and supplies by sea, because the trip to Dakar from disembarkation ports would be far more hazardous than was the transfer of Nazi troops from Italian ports to Tripoli.

The sea and ocean trip to Dakar would require more ships than the Axis and Axis-controlled nations now possess.

So, even though Vichy surrendered Dakar unconditionally, the voyage to Dakar would still be in the nature of an invasion for the Axis forces, as their fleets would have to pass through ocean areas controlled by the British fleet. It is doubtful if such an invasion fleet would ever reach Dakar by sea.

Transportation of land troops and equipment from landing places in North Africa now in Axis hands would require a virtual surrender to British colonial armies of all Axis control in Africa and Asia Minor. The lands through which such German and Italian forces must pass would be as hostile to them as they are to the British and Free French.

So, it is extremely doubtful if the Axis armies would ever reach Dakar. Desert heat and sand, hostile countries and inhabitants, now pursuing British and Free French forces, would destroy the Axis army also as it marched to Dakar.

* * *

Thus, the value of Dakar itself is not altogether clear.

Some light on the key to the mystery, however, may be reflected in an accompanying comment, which appears elsewhere on these pages.

The port Dakar has some facilities for the repair of ships, open piers for the loading and unloading of cargoes, a fairly good harbor, an ice refrigeration plant, no industry to speak of, and a few sites for air fields on the edge of the desert.

So that Dakar itself is not a prize worth the expense in men, ships and suffering necessary to capture it. Dakar is essentially a peacetime port.

But, as we've said, that is not all of the story.

# A Key to the Dakar Mystery?

IN AN article in *Rossiya* (July 8), a White Russian daily issued in New York City, Boris L. Brazol under the caption, "Dakar, a Financial Information," suggests a key to the mysterious importance of the African port.

"The Dakar incident," he writes, "has inspired the author . . . to make research so as to find out what there is so important about Dakar that it has created such an alarm in Washington.

"Here is the explanation:

"On May 22, 1880, to the family of Oppenheimer's residing in England a son was born and given the name of Ernest. In his later years he received a title for his contributions to various philanthropic institutions. Sir Ernest married a girl by the name of Lina Pollack and had a son by her, who was named Harry Frederic.

"In 1902 — after the Boer war — the senior Oppenheimer migrated with others of his clan to Transvaal, South Africa, where, through a friendly support of Anglo-Jewish banks, he was able to establish several gold mining industries, including the notorious Anglo-American Corporation of South Africa.

" " "

"Thus the English Oppenheimers consolidated with their American clan. The important area of activity for this corporation *is located south of Dakar.*

"It controls a whole line of enterprises, such as copper, coal and gold mines, under the names of Anglo-American Investment Trust, Ltd., Brakpan Mines, Ltd., South African Land and Exploration Co., Ltd., Transvaal Coal Corporation, Nchanga Consolidated, Ltd., New Era Consolidated Copper Mines, Ltd., Rhokona Copper, Ltd., De Beers Consolidated Mines Diamond Trading Corporation.

"All these, and numerous other mining and gold mining industries, even though they appear as being independent and individual corporations, are run by a small closely interrelated group at the head of which are Oppenheimer, father and son, including George Friedlander and O. and L. Oppenheimer," the writer continues.

" " "

"The threads of this multi-million property extend to the Anglo-American Corporation *located in Dakar,* and from there to the headquarters of the Oppenheimers in London at No. 11 Old Jewry Street.

"All their business is solid and the income is immense," Mr. Brazol writes. "The corporation employs exclusively native labor that is paid a beggarly wage.

"Hence, it is not surprising that the Rhokona Copper, Ltd., paid in 1936 and 1937 a dividend on each share as high as 62.5 per cent; and the South African Land and Exploration Co., Ltd., has earned on each share 142 per cent, and in 1939, 162 per cent.

"Sir Ernest Oppenheimer is one of the most influential directors of Barclay Bank, Ltd., which finances a multitude of first class Jewish enterprises in England and in other parts of the world."

## Bankruptcy Bitter Fruit of Usury

IF THE money power has a strangle-hold on the world today, it is because the determination and persistence of the financiers who dominate it have been superior to the moral fibre of the world's national leaders.

The people have been misled; and their leaders likewise have been misled, or corrupted.

By guile and deceit, and based on human greed, sloth and stupidity, has the great and far-flung structure of the money power been built until today it controls the whole world.

True words! They are gleaned from Mr. A. N. Field's book: "*The Truth About the Slump,*" published by him at Nelson, New Zealand.

The author continues:

"If astute financiers are leading us into a slavery of gigantic unpayable debt, we are merely reaping the fruits of what we have sown. Usury, condemned by the religion we profess, condemned by all the ancient peoples of the world, we have made the very basis of our civilization.

"By enacting laws making gold the sole legal tender, we have created an artificial scarcity of the means of payment, and have thus made enslavement in usury the universal lot of mankind.

### Just the Interest!

ANNUAL interest charges on the national debt have increased by 5,000 per cent since the period immediately preceding World War I.

At that time the interest payment amounted to about $23-million. At the end of 1919 the charge had increased, with the increased debt, to approximately $619-million.

By the end of 1942 the estimated interest charge will be $1,275,000,000.

"Debt, which like poverty, should be the complaint of occasional victims of misfortune, is the normal life-long state of all. The usurers today sit at the forefront of the banquet of life and rule our world.

"Aristotle, living two thousand years ago, very properly ranked them with the keepers of houses of ill-fame. Cato, asked what he thought of usury, replied by asking his questioner what he thought of murder.

" 'Nothing is baser, nothing more cruel, than the usury of this world,' said St. Chrysostom.

"St. Basil called it 'the last pitch of inhumanity,' and of the borrower's fate, this Christian Bishop of sixteen hundred years ago wrote:

" 'At first a man is bright and joyous; he shines with another's splendor . . . But the money slips away. Time as it runs on adds the interest to its tale. Now night brings him no rest; no day is joyous; no sun is bright; he is weary of life; he hates the days that are hurrying on to the appointed period; he is afraid of the months for they are the parents of interest . . . Usury is the origin of lying, the beginning of ingratitude, unfairness and perjury.'

"St. Gregory of Nyssa, the immortal thinker of the Fourth Century, wrote these lines:

" 'He who would give the name of robbery or parricide to the iniquitous invention of interest would not be very far from the truth. What, indeed, does it signify if you have made yourselves masters of the wealth of another by scaling walls or by killing passers-by, or if you have acquired what belongs to you by the merciless method of the loan?'

" " "

"If anyone had prophesied to St. Gregory as follows:

" 'A day will come when that thou treatest as robbery and assassination will become the law of the world, and when an Attorney-General will indict in an Assize Court writers who share thy opinion. The whole of society will be founded on usury. They will build a temple which they will call a Stock Exchange. This temple will fill the place of thy cathedrals, even as thy cathedrals have filled the place of the temples of Venus and Jupiter. The priests serving in this new temple will be called bankers, stockbrokers and financiers. They will swindle others out of the gold that will ensure to them omnipotence. They will buy everything that is buyable, and some of the things that are not. And vain revolts against their frightful empire will serve only to make more manifest its terrible solidity.'

"If anyone had prophesied that to St. Gregory, who believed in God, he would have joined his hands and cried:

" '*Lord, deliver us from such a moral malady!*'

"The malady has run its course."

---

## More on Usury

"STARTLING as it may appear," wrote Mr. Arthur Kitson, in his book "*The Money Question,*" "it is nevertheless an easily demonstrated fact that, under the current rates of interest, the debtor classes of nearly all civilized nations are rushing into bankruptcy.

"The fact is that the wealth production of nations cannot keep pace for long with their interest charges.

"In fact, *interest as a universal working principle is — at all ordinary rates — an impossibility.* Five per cent interest means a doubling of wealth every twenty years. At compound interest it is doubled in about fourteen and a half years . . .

"Usury is always increasing more rapidly than wealth. It knows no period of depression, no time of stagnation, no failure of crops, no unfortunate speculations, no condition of ill-health and inability to produce. It takes no holiday, and refuses even to keep the Sabbath. It forever goes on as regular as time, and as relentlessly as gravitation, counting and adding to men's burdens, piling them higher and higher, until the loan becomes too great, and there is a financial crash. No system of production has yet been discovered capable of maintaining this regular, never-failing supply which usury demands.

"All forms of wealth production are fitful, irregular, and subject to fluctuations. One season's harvest is abundant and the next a failure. This year's fruit crop may prove enormous, and the next Spring's frost may kill all the blossoms. The consequence is that though for a limited period production may make rapid progress, yet, like the hare and the tortoise, usury invariably overtakes and keeps ahead of production.

"Every certain period there is a universal

(Continued on Page 12)

# Comment

(Continued from Page 11)

breakdown; panics and bankruptcy become world - wide; interest - bearing wealth is swept away, and equilibrium is restored only after interest-bearing capital has been greatly reduced . . .

"Startling as it may seem, it is an indisputable fact that panics, bankruptcies and failures are absolutely necessary in order to keep the system alive . . . Usury, like gravitation, causes large bodies to attract and eventually absorb the smaller ones. The small capital of individuals is being constantly absorbed by the greater capital of corporations. This is its inevitable tendency. The forces of attraction and absorption are as strong, constant and relentless in the monetary as in the physical world.

" 'Usury,' says Lord Bacon, 'bringeth the treasure of a realm into a few hands.' "

---

## Watch Sir Otto

IF ONE is really desirous of knowing what the future has in store for the United States, it is always a good idea to watch the activity of certain international financiers. They usually come here with empty hands, full stomachs, and "loaded" plans.

The shores of America were recently visited by Sir Otto Niemeyer, described in press notices on his arrival as a "British financier and a director of the Bank of England."

Speaking about inflation, Sir Otto said: "We're on our guard. Some of the safeguards being applied are larger taxation, Government bond and loan campaigns, and the rationing of most articles."

These bankers of international ramifications are always "on their guard."

Their only offering to the suffering peoples of the world are unbearable taxation, usurious loans, and "fictitious" bonds.

And now, the final link is being fastened around the necks of the people — rationing of their necessities; all presented in the guise of sacrifice for war or defense, and hiding behind the bogey of "inflation"!

We are not unmindful of the memorable telegram that Lord Northcliffe, who also was in the United States as a British representative, sent to his government in 1917, when Treasury Secretary MacAdoo requested that someone in authority be sent to America to arrange for loans:

"They (certain financiers) are complete masters of the situation as regards themselves, Canada, France, Italy and Russia . . . *If loans stop, war stops.*"

* * *

But, back to Sir Otto.

Like most of the directors of the Bank of England, he is not listed in the British "Who's Who."

He was born in England and, on his mother's side, the line is British for several generations. His father was a native of Hanover, Germany, who came to England because his country was annexed by the Prussians, and he became a naturalized British subject.

A graduate of Oxford University, Niemeyer spent his early years with the Exchequer department of Britain, being carefully groomed to become an executive of the privately controlled Bank of England. His training covered the momentous years from 1906 to 1922 when he was deemed ready for larger responsibilities.

Soon after the First World War, the gold controllers decided the time was ripe to establish Reserve Banks all over the world. For the benefit of the uninitiated, "Reserve Banks" are simply Central Banks of issue with the supreme power to coin and regulate money without interference of any governments. In fact, those who control the Central Banks control governments and through them, the people.

A conference was called in Genoa in 1922, attended by Mr. Montagu Norman, Governor of the Bank of England, the Governor of the Bank of France, the Governor of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, and other international financiers. That conference directed the course of European and American history for the last twenty years.

For example, one of the fruits of that banker conference was the planned inflation of the German mark and enabled the internationalists to obtain the ownership of the physical wealth of Germany.

This was where Sir Otto came into the picture.

* * *

After the elections in England, in 1922, Sir Otto accompanied Mr. Bonar Law to the German Reparations Conference at Paris, where Mr. Law produced the plan to give Germany a four years' moratorium, which enabled her to stop all reparations payments on the First World War during that period.

The French representatives refused to agree because their country had borne the brunt of the German military destruction. The proceedings ended in disorder. Following on this conference, a steady depreciation of the German mark began—generally believed to have been an engineered swindle that enabled Germany to default on her World War debts.

* * *

In 1924, Sir Otto was instrumental as a member of the British Treasury Committee in having Britain return to the gold standard, with all its trail of misery on the English people.

Sir Otto accompanied the Chancellor of the Exchequer to the United States when the British war debt was funded and Britain promised to pay America annuities for 62 years. This plan was only a stop-gap before total repudiation. It let the American Government down easy.

Sir Otto has been the international financiers' messenger-boy and money doctor forging link upon link around the neck of India, Egypt, Greece, Brazil, Roumania, Argentina and last, but not least, New Zealand and Australia.

He was a member of the League of Nation's Finance Committee for many years and Chairman of the Bank for International Settlements in 1937, aiming for world control of economics with its ultimate domination.

* * *

One of Sir Otto's crowning achievements came in establishing the Central Bank of New Zealand and his successful imposition of a clause in the *Charter* permitting foreigners to hold the bank shares.

In New Zealand and Australia, the people and their leaders have a very advanced knowledge of the private money system and its nefarious control. It looked for a time that they would be entirely free of the internationalistic control.

When things went awry, Niemeyer was dispatched to fasten the golden yoke on them. It seems that a real Labor government refused (imagine their insolence!) to pay the Bank of England some $400-million annual interest tribute.

Sir Otto engineered the *coup* that led to the overthrow of the genuine Labor group and the substitution of a fake Labor government subservient to the Bank of England in all things where bonds, interest, and financial shackles are involved.

In New Zealand, Sir Otto also put over the *Mortgage Corporation Bill* in 1935, also permitting foreigners to own the controlling shares instead of patriotic New Zealanders who were able and willing. In this connection, Mr. Field said:

"Another very curious thing happened when the *Mortgage Corporation Bill* came before Parliament in 1935. This measure set up a second great (the first one being the Reserve Bank) privately-owned concern to take over the loans of the government lending departments, or rather to take them over to the extent to which they were good, leaving the rest on the taxpayers' backs."

* * *

Sir Otto is going to spend about a month with officials of the United States Treasury on a financial mission. Just maybe, he is going to put over another *Mortgage Corporation Bill* whereby the best loans of the R.F.C. and other independent Government financial agencies can be consolidated into the World Bank (some say it is already being constructed in the new International City in Northern Ireland), while the American taxpayers are loaded with the bad debts of the New Deal.

Or, just maybe, Sir Otto is going to spin the web that will draw the United States into the war. We know that the movements of the British currency and credit instruments are remarkably similar to the moves in 1915 and 1916 — which resulted in America's banking houses drawing the nation into the war.

Or, just maybe, Sir Otto is going to build the superstructure of deflation. Professor Keynes has been here from England and laid the groundwork, and while he talks beautiful theory, the actions he recommends are nothing but State Socialism.

---

**WANTED!**

**BOYS TO WORK AS SALESMEN FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE PAPER**

**Simply fill out the enclosed blank and a representative will call at your home and furnish you with all the data. Address — Social Justice Publishing Company, Royal Oak, Michigan.**

*Name* _____

*Address* _____

*City* _____ *State* _____

**BOYS—Mail immediately and you will start making money at once.**

# How Has Communism Worked in Red Russia?

THERE IS no Sunday in Soviet Russia today.

There is no day of rest, no special day on which worship is rendered to God.

The precept "*Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God, the things that are God's*" was dealt a stunning blow by the Red regime.

It was replaced by the slogan: "Render everything to Caesar. There is no God."

But, how did all this come about? asks the *Catholic Herald* of New Orleans, Louisiana. An enlightening article in this magazine answers. We quote a portion of it.

"If Communism," continues the *Herald*, "were a political system merely, a system by which all classes of men, whether the lowliest laborers, or the most skilled artists and scientists, all were to share and share alike the profits and the wealth of the nation, why should Communists have begun their reign by the burning of churches, the murdering of priests and religious as well as the laity who adhered to religious practices?

"Why propose to distribute the wealth of the nation to its citizens equally, and begin by destroying the greatest wealth the citizens had, their churches, their religion?

"Why begin by murdering millions of Christian believers?

"The answer is this: Communism is an artificial super-imposed system of government, which recognizes no symmetry in natural laws, no divine inspiration, no code of right or wrong in morals, and as such first and foremost declares its unrelentless war on all those who believe in God.

"Having cut off all sense of moral responsibility to God, the Communist turns loose upon a world of unsuspecting men, plunging them into the worst turmoil the world has ever known.

"The Communist tells you that you are a 'comrade,' and that you are entitled to share the wealth of the nation, even the world.

"When some twenty years ago this propaganda was unleashed on the unsuspecting, and largely peasant population of Russia, we saw what happened. We saw that there were numberless people among the Russians who did not accept the philosophy of the Red regime that was striving to impose its artificial code on the people.

"Although poor, or of medium standing, the Russians who adhered to their Christian faith did not want to share the wealth of the nation; they did not want to come into sudden possession of riches which they felt were not theirs. The Christian conscience of these godly men warned them that an unjust system of the Communistic brand could never bring rewards, but only confusion and chaos, the like of which they had never seen before.

"Being poor did not mean being dishonorable. One ate his bread, and lodged on his humble cot with a peaceful heart. There was no remorse of conscience in such living. Moreover, there was the expectation of a better life hereafter. But this sudden sharing of wealth, this sudden possession of property, which the Communist promised, must bring with it a sting of conscience, the sting that comes with stealing.

"Likewise there were other points in Communism, such as the bold proclamations about the supremacy of the State, which made many a thoughtful Russian wary, and made him turn a deaf ear to Communism.

* * *

The Red regime realized that moral responsibility to God, this one factor, blocked the way to Communism.

"Ruthlessly then, did the Red regime butcher Christians by the thousands, hundreds of thousands, and millions.

"If religious convictions kept men from adopting Communism, then religion had to be given a stunning blow. Churches were burned or converted into stables and storage houses. Priests and religious were either killed or sent to perish in Siberia.

"Then followed the taking over by the government of factories, shops, industry, business, agriculture. The talented inventor who was head of his engineering plant was sent to Siberia, and an uneducated, almost brainless Bolshevik who yelled for Communism . . . came into his own. The most unscrupulous were installed in prominent positions.

"And so the wealth of the citizens was absorbed, taken over, grabbed by the government, and then once in government hands, was turned over to individual Bolsheviks to run.

"But we still wait for that equal distribution of wealth! Was it ever realized?

"To those who want to know the truth in the situation, the following report on conditions in Russia will reveal the state of affairs there. The wildest clamorers for Marxist Communism today *admit that Communism is the saddest bluff in the world!*

* * *

"Those who once actually believed that it would be possible to impose an equal distribution of wealth among citizens, whether they be ditch-diggers, plumbers, paper-hangers, mechanics, inventors, writers, or artists, now admit that the five-year plan of Russia that turned into a twenty-years plan has failed, and continues ever more miserably to fail as time goes on.

"The poor of Russia who subscribed to the Red regime, and exchanged their religious conscience for the Red method, still wait for that distribution of wealth.

"Those poor people have been sadly deluded. The wages of laborers of Russia when compared to those of Americans under our capitalistic system, even in our depression time, offer something to think about.

"Wages of workers there are as low as 100 rubles monthly (equal to $5 a week), and upwards to 170 and 180 rubles monthly, or about $7 or $8 weekly. These low wages are by no means rare exceptions.

"Yet an engineer in that same Russia, which proposed to make an even distribution of wealth, and to turn over the country to labor, yes, an engineer in Communist Russia will get, not unusually, a salary of 8,000 rubles a month, or some $400 weekly!

* * *

"But there is something more to add. If all industry, all business, all shops, and so on, are owned by the government, you will ask, what does a man with a huge income, like the ordinary engineer above mentioned, do with his money?

"The following is the answer: The engineer with all his surplus thousands at the end of the year, deposits them at the State Bank, all banks belonging to the State. Here he receives as high as 7 and 8 per cent interest, which is free from all income tax and all inheritance tax.

"That is the sort of 'equal distribution' of wealth Russia has offered her people. While the laborer who earns about $5 weekly, is said to own all the factories, the industry, the farms, the income from these do not go to him, but they go in 8 per cent interest to the class that earns exorbitant incomes of $400 weekly, etc.

"That is what Communism stands for in Russia.

"Whatever it is in theory, whatever it is in propaganda, the above explanation will indicate clearly what Communism is in practice."

---

## Red Aid Not for Russian People

ADMITTEDLY, Americans do not know what is going on.

A New York correspondent, with the future welfare of his country in mind, quotes from a letter sent to President Roosevelt by the "Russian-American National Committee."

It should be revealing. It reads:

"It is with grave concern and profound regret that this Committee, representing loyal Americans of Russian descent, is viewing a well-marked tendency on the part of certain officials of the Administration to extend America's material assistance, not to Russia, not to the Russian people, but to the Red Dictatorship personified by Stalin. We believe it would be a fatal mistake for the United States to champion the Soviet cause for the following reasons:

"First. Russia of today is dominated by a vicious *clique* of international plotters, known as the Comintern, seeking to undermine by subversive propaganda, or to overthrow by force and violence lawfully constituted governments all over the world. So long as Russia is continued to be exploited as a huge *place d'armes* of world revolution, peace on earth cannot and will not be restored.

"Second. Recent official investigations conducted on these shores unmistakably demonstrate the fact that the local Communists, financed by Moscow, are feverishly engaged in all kinds of disloyal activities directed against the United States. They are corrupting our youth. They are sowing seeds of revolutionary propaganda among our soldiers and sailors. They foster class hatred, and they are exerting every effort in an attempt to ridicule those very principles upon which this free land of ours is built.

"Third. Among the countless crimes against civilization committed by the Com-

(Continued on Page 14)

# Comment

(Continued from Page 13)

munist oppressors entrenched in the Kremlin, perhaps the most despicable is their revolt against religion, their barbaric treatment of the ministers of God, their systematic and ruthless extermination of every vestige of religious thought. In point of fact, during the years of the red rule Soviet commissars have either destroyed or closed some 50,000 Russian Orthodox churches, and at the same time they have murdered in cold blood or otherwise exterminated tens of thousands of Christian priests.

"By demolishing Christian churches these godless politicians hope to destroy the Church of Christ. It should be also borne in mind that the red tyranny cost the Russian people up to 50-million lives—a grand total comprising those who died of starvation and epidemics during the great famines of 1921-22 and 1931-32, as well as of those who have been done away with by the infamous G.P.U.

"Shall America lend her helping hand not to the Russian people, but to a foreign government which is endeavoring to overthrow our own?

"Shall we place in the hands of the Comintern ammunition which will be used against us?

"Shall we, by giving support to the red rulers, renounce those ideals for which, in the past, Americans have given their lives, and which, under solemn oath we have pledged to defend?

"Moreover, American support to Stalin and his henchmen would be regarded by the downtrodden and hunger-stricken Russian as an act of great injustice toward them. The Russians are eagerly looking forward to the blessed hour of their liberation. For those tens of millions of peasants who have been deprived of their homes and lands and driven by machine-gun into 'collective farms,' for those toiling masses which are being kept in bondage in the Soviet State factories; for those countless sufferers who are being tortured in concentration camps — for all those destitute and unfortunate Soviet slaves, the Communist government is a symbol of incompetence, corruption and bestiality.

"The Russians will not fight for Stalin, even if we give them our ablest military experts and the best of our American equipment. And every American dollar paid into the treasury of the Comintern, will be conceived by the Russians as an attempt on the part of this country to prolong the agony of their miserable existence under the red yoke."

* * *

Does anyone really believe an alignment with Russia will help to preserve the "four freedoms"?

"Individualism must be drugged that Communism may succeed," Stalin said.

The American people have been drugged, by means of deception and confusion. No business recovery was ever intended.

Socialist legislation has destroyed our economics, making business unprofitable and employment impossible. It is significant that those in high places advocate Marxian ideologies, which are hostile to our *Constitution.*

National collapse is engineered under the guise of defense and democracy.

**Hollywood Censorship**

## Reviewer Exposes Radio-Film Tie-up

CHARGING that officials of the Columbia Broadcasting System, under pressure from Hollywood motion picture producers, attempted to restrict his freedom of speech, Jimmy Fidler, nationally known movie critic, has cancelled his contract with C.B.S. and shifted his program to the Mutual Broadcasting System.

In a statement released August 18, a copy of which was sent to the Federal Communications Commission, Fidler declared that C.B.S. sought to impose a censorship on his reviews of motion pictures.

"Despite the fact that I am a recognized motion picture authority and critic with 21 years' experience, the Columbia Broadcasting Co. insisted that I must give a 'favorable' notice (three or more bells) to all so-called 'big pictures reviewed by me, and no less than two bells and favorable notice to any 'B' product reviewed by me,' " Fidler disclosed.

"In other words, even though a picture was downright bad, I was not permitted to say so," he continued. "If I reviewed it at all, I had to give it good bell ratings and praising reviews. In such cases I chose the only other path left open; I refused to review bad films.

"The only motion pictures the Columbia network would permit me to review honestly (if they deserved panning) were movies produced by independent or small companies, or in other countries. Obviously then, Columbia was censoring me not because officials of the broadcasting chain believed my reviews biased or inaccurate but for reasons best known to themselves and at variance with a frank, unbiased review of motion pictures on my part.

* * *

"Had I been willing to compromise my own honest opinion by telling listeners that pictures I deemed bad were good and had I been willing to speak only praise of the film industry, I might have continued my Columbia Broadcasting System association. But I would have moved about with a hanging head, ashamed of my own deceit.

"My Hollywood column is published in well over a hundred daily and Sunday newspapers from coast to coast. These newspapers are decent, honest, fair and American. Certainly they are not going to jeopardize their good reputations by publishing editorial matter that is dishonest, malicious or unfair. Yet these newspapers have on many occasions published material that the Columbia Broadcasting Co., in its 'righteousness,' has censored 'for policy reasons.'

"I have never made a statement on the air which was prompted by any malicious motive any more than I would do so in my column. As a motion picture authority, I have fairly criticized certain people and customs of the studios. The criticisms have often incurred the wrath of studio executives, and I know for a fact that some heads of the film industry, unable to 'take it,' have gone to my sponsors and Columbia in protest and have tried to 'get my job.'

"In my opinion, it is largely because of these studio protests that I was forced to bear such rigid censorship — a censorship that caused me to beg my sponsors for release

"I am sending a copy of this statement to the Federal Communications Commission. It seems to me that members of that Commission will be interested in Columbia's attitude concerning the rights of fair comment and free speech. Broadcasting systems are not a public utility, but they certainly must owe their public a reasonable responsibility.

"It seems to me that there is a serious question whether a network discharges its public duty when it restricts a commentator who is a recognized authority, and who had been broadcasting along established lines for 7 years, so that he cannot continue to speak as an authority and as he has always spoken, but, instead, must submit to censor and editing of his material to a point making fair comment and criticism almost impossible."

Mr. Fidler said that Columbia's censorship policy has "hampered and worried me to the point that I have felt and feel that I have been denied the right of free speech. I consider the fetters that have been imposed by Columbia officials as resulting in my carrying on a program so 'old ladyish' as to constitute a slap in the face of this right of free speech so long recognized as the inalienable privilege of a citizen of this country."

* * *

As the champion of the "American way of life" Wendell Willkie, who has been retained as counsel for the movie moguls in the Senate propaganda inquiry, might well investigate his clients' record of anti-Americanism.

Ever since the present war began, Hollywood has been palming off war propaganda under the guise of entertainment. During the Spanish civil war, leaders of the film colony and their Marxist stooges lined up actively on the side of the Red Loyalists. Hollywood's reputation for smut and immorality has long been established, as has its ability to incorporate those characteristics into the movies it produces.

Now, Mr. Fidler reveals another Hollywood contribution to the nation, made in collaboration with the gentlemen in control of the Columbia Broadcasting Company. Probably aware of the fact that many of their pictures cannot stand on merit, cannot withstand fair comment and criticism, the movie makers have taken it upon themselves to stifle freedom of speech.

On the basis of Fidler's expose it appears that the same crowd of radio officials who co-operated in this endeavor with those warmongering, filth-purveying anti-Christians succeeded in taking Father Coughlin off the air.

How long will the anti-Christians of Hollywood find Christians like Mr. Willkie to defend them?

How long will decent Americans tolerate such "control"?


## 'Rulers of Russia'

**REQUESTS for the book, *"Rulers of Russia"* by Father Denis Fahey, will continue to be filled as long as the present supply lasts.**

**An American edition, revised and enlarged, has been prepared by Social Justice Publishing Co., through arrangement with Father Fahey of Dublin.**

**In view of the present situation in Russia, the background of this book is more than ever timely. Address Social Justice, Royal Oak, Michigan.**

**Note—The entire stock of *"An Answer to Father Coughlin's Critics"* has been exhausted.**

# Comment

## Critic Assists Senate Film Probe

WITH WILY Wendell Willkie attempting to turn the Senate's motion picture investigation into a "Keystone comedy," it is not at all unlikely that the real fruits of the inquiry may be little more than those which fall to the "campaign orator" in the form of a fat fee and a bundle of publicity.

Newspapers, with fat revenues from movie advertisers, have already been lined up by the Hollywood press agents and are ridiculing the whole idea of a Senate investigation of Hollywood war-mongering.

But, if the unexpected does happen, and the Senate Committee is permitted to make any real headway, it might do worse than pursue a few "leads" submitted by A. W. ('Bill') Wells, Hollywood's stormy petrel of the Wells Feature syndicate.

Assertedly familiar with the Hollywood scene through his press and radio activities out there, Mr. Wells insists that the movie capital is "crawling with Communists and fellow travelers" and declares he has been blacklisted by movie moguls for his militant opposition to the Marxian way of life espoused by the *ruling clique*.

In a letter to Senator Bennett Champ Clark, Wells asserted that shortly after he had inserted in the *Hollywood Daily Variety* a protest against the support of Communism by the motion picture industry he was denied a renewal of his press card.

Tom Pettey, press representative of the Motion Picture Producers Association, told him, Wells said, "that if I had a Communist Party membership card my own press card would be renewed.

"Since then," his letter continues, "I have been blacklisted and boycotted by the moving picture industry, radio and newspapers . . .

"Joe Schenck, at the time he was president of the Motion Picture Producers Association and head of production and president of 20th Century-Fox Film Corporation, appropriated my title, *'Cavalcade of Hollywood'* and used it with a bit of twisting around as the title for a $2-million motion picture released as *'Hollywood Cavalcade.'* My title was registered as a trade mark in the United States patent office on May 5, 1939."

Wells' letter said that Schenck — who was free on bond pending his appeal of a 3-year prison sentence and a $20,000 fine for income tax evasion — is "spending thousands to try to soften up the American public through appearances on charity committees (the President's infantile paralysis fund and others) and has caused to have published sympathy-appealing articles (like the ones appearing in *Liberty* magazine). He is now working hard to influence public opinion toward a declaration of war by the United States."

Referring to the war propaganda now emanating from Hollywood studios, Wells charged that "there are many under-cover currents that bring pressure on motion picture and radio directors, producers and writers.

"One of them is headed by B'nai B'rith, a Jewish international organization which is ably supported financially by Hollywood and international capitalism.

"Its president, Henry Monsky of Omaha, Nebraska, was recently appointed by F.D.R. to a top position in the organization of the Office of Civilian Defense along with Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg and William Bullitt. The Hollywood efforts on propaganda to get the United States into the World War originate and have the full support of Washington."

Wells said that another group working tirelessly for war is the *Anti-Defamation League*, which "stops at nothing in its efforts to publicly discredit any individual who dares oppose any subversive activity (such as Communism) that is Jewish, or who mentions anything unflattering to Jewry."

This organization, he declared, "is breeding, instead of lessening anti-Semitism. In conjunction with other radicals it sponsors the *National Council of Jews and Christians*, with James M. Yard, a militant Communist supporter, heading the Chicago branch. It, to quote its aide, Stanley High, 'has set up its machinery in 310 cities.' It reaches 1,000 campuses. Two hundred daily papers subscribe to its features. Its radio recordings appear on 165 radio stations. During 1939, under its auspices, speakers appeared at 10,000 meetings in 2,000 communities in the United States.

*B'nai B'rith Magazine* (issue of July, 1940) recommends a book, *"Mr. Smith Meet Mr. Cohen,"* in which are explained *"Eight Ways to Fight"* opponents as anti-Semites, Wells declared.

"The book is by James Waterman Wise (son of Rabbi Wise) and Lee J. Levinger, an author of B'nai B'rith propaganda. How Levinger's son, Samuel, was honored by Rabbi Stephen Wise and son, James, for dying for Spain's Loyalist Reds, was told by the *B'nai B'rith Messenger* on page 234 of the issue of 3/39.

"Among the eight ways to fight, recommended by Levinger and Wise and *B'nai B'rith Magazine*, Method No. 3 shows how, instead of answering the charges of an opponent, the person making the charges should be attacked and shown up as a 'Nazi rat.' A cartoon illustrating this method portrays a hand focusing the rays of a pocket flashlight on a rat labeled with a Nazi swastika.

"Method No. 8 advises Jews to take their stand with Communists despite criticisms.

"In Method No. 5 on discipline, satisfaction is expressed at the recent restriction of radio time for controversial discussions prejudicial to Jewry. A picture illustrating that method shows an uplifted hand holding a candle-snuffer about to snuff out a candle labeled 'Coughlinism.' And so the book continues for 387 pages.

"Mr. George Sokolsky (himself a Jew) in his article *'These Days,' New York Sun* (April 15, 1941) says as follows: 'But these Jewish leaders say in effect, "You must agree with us on all questions, political, social, economic, international — or we will smear you as anti-Semitic." I hope you will believe me when I tell you that they are doing infinitely more harm to the Jews in the United States. They are the authors of the Jewish question.' "

* * *

Any investigation of the Hollywood war propaganda, says Wells, must include an investigation of B'nai B'rith, its *Anti-Defamation League* and the *Anti-Nazi League*.

"Your Committee," he told Senator Clark, "will at once be labeled as anti-Semitic and the pressure put on its members through Washington, where everything 'all out' or 'short of war' starts and stops.

"May I suggest that you also look into the workings of the New York office of the *Council for National Defense*, headed by Nelson Rockefeller. This group advances the Hollywood ideologies in all Latin American countries, and your investigators will find the same B'nai B'rith pulling the strings and their own members in the front ranks of the organization for promoting cultural relations with South America.

"A close inspection of the scripts of the movies for Latin American showings will also bring out a startling truth.

"Short wave radio beamed from the United States to Latin American people should also be investigated, and also the reason for the tieup with the Department of Justice on the so-called *'Free Company'* broadcasts over Columbia."

---

## On Hollywood Orders

HOLLYWOOD movie makers are adept not only at drumming up hate and war psychology through the medium of the screen, but also at coercing their employes to attend interventionist rallies.

This is evident from information submitted to the Senate recently by Senator Burton K. Wheeler of Montana, who read from the floor two letters distributed by Twentieth-Century-Fox Film Corporation admonishing employes to be present at Hollywood Bowl for a "unity" speech by Wendell L. Willkie.

"It is imperative that the Hollywood Bowl be crowded to overflowing," read one letter signed 'D.F.Z.' — presumably Darryl F. Zanuck. "Mr. Willkie must leave Hollywood realizing that the motion picture industry is behind him in his fight for national unity. He must know that the good Americans of Hollywood can turn out *as strongly as the bums and the other subversive elements turned out for Mr. Lindbergh.*"

The "national unity" referred to, of course, is unity in support of the Administration's pro-war policies. The *"bums and other subversive elements,"* more than 40,000 strong, who flocked to hear Mr. Lindbergh, were loyal Americans imbued with Americanism rather than Britishism or internationalism.

The second letter read by Wheeler, signed by a "William Koenig," stated that "all personnel of each department will be dismissed today at 4:30 p. m. in order that they will have time to go to the Hollywood Bowl to hear Wendell Willkie make an important speech."

Instructions were given for employes to meet at the Hollywood American Legion Post and march in a body to the Hollywood Bowl.

The first letter made it clear that department heads would be held responsible for attendance by their subordinates.

Despite this high pressure brand of war-mongering, only about 15,000 persons turned out to hear Willkie, whereas the Lindbergh rally a short time before drew between 40,000 and 50,000.

# Letters

**SOCIAL JUSTICE aims to make this page a free forum and readers' opinions are invited. Naturally the views expressed are not always those of this magazine. We cannot guarantee that contributions sent to SOCIAL JUSTICE can be returned to the writers. Letters not signed with the writer's name and address cannot be considered, although the name will not necessarily be used. We reserve the right to publish all letters received unless contrary instruction is specifically given.**

## Keep Writing

TO THE EDITOR:

You hear some people say, "What's the use of writing to Washington? They will do what they wish."

Now, a few drops of water make no perceptible impression upon a stone but continued drops wear it away! Moral: Keep up your writing!

Is it too much to ask every peace-loving American to write every week to the President — at a cost of 3 cents ?

Or even to your two Senators and the Congressman from your district, at a cost of 12 cents in all?

If we go to war, your taxes alone will far exceed 12 cents a week. So write now. The American people do not want war.

If our Government sends our men into war zones and a shooting incident occurs, the officials of the United States Government will be to blame. — **T.J.D.**

*Philadelphia, Pa.*

## Irish 'Criminals'

TO THE EDITOR:

I hope you took notice that Gen. Marshall stated that most of the letters demanding that selectees be released after their year of training service, came from "members of the Christian Front and the German American bund."

Although I am a Protestant, I would think it an honor to belong to the Christian Front.

Another thing to which I would like to call your attention is that in the little dramas on the radio, to which I sometimes listen, every rascal, political boss, official of bad government, etc., *bears an Irish name!*

When one reads the criminal records in the New York newspapers, however, he sees that the real criminals are not Irish by a tremendous majority.

Why is this subject never mentioned; and why do the Irish-Americans, who are so prominent in New York after all, do nothing about it? — **L. McN. C.**

*New York City, N. Y.*

## Social Justice No 'Straddler'

TO THE EDITOR:

May I offer my sincere congratulations to the author of the article appearing in the current issue of your magazine under the title, *"Frank Murphy and the Knights of Columbus."*

This comment and the one directly following, *"More on the Same Subject,"* answered questions and emphasized fine points that must have been reflected in the minds of many of the 80 per cent Catholics to whom you referred.

Of all the criticisms that I read, that of which I write impressed me most favorably. It was both pertinent and complete.

SOCIAL JUSTICE may sometimes commit sins of "intemperance" and may occasionally offend by its choice of personal descriptives, but, God love it, never can it be said, in truth, either by friend or foe, that SOCIAL JUSTICE straddles!

It is refreshing, and encouraging to the rank and file, at a time when fear seems to paralyze the vocal chords of too many moral leaders; when 'expediency' persuades the opinions of others, to find fearlessness and intellectual honesty still represented.

*Philadelphia, Pa.* — **I.A.T.**

## Americans Are Smarter Than That

TO THE EDITOR:

In comparison with the peoples of other nations, I have always considered the intelligence of the average American to be of fairly high rating; but, judging from some of the raw deals being pulled off on the American public, maybe I've been wrong.

For instance:

The President says that we must destroy Hitler and make the world safe for democracy. So, we aid imperialist England and Communist Russia. Finland, a true and honest democracy, is "our enemy."

Roosevelt says we must fight to keep the seas free. So, we deny shipments of food to the non-combatant populations of the world and tell them they must get their food from Hitler. At the same time they are encouraged to sabotage his industry.

Mr. Roosevelt says Hitler is a menace to Christianity. So, we unite with atheistic Communism and place the job of formulating the policies of our country in the hands of international Jews.

The President says that we must make the world a better place in which to live. So, we pour out billions of dollars worth of goods to any nation fighting Hitler. If a shortage of necessities exists in our own country, the American people (who are paying the whole bill) are immediately threatened with "Crack-downs."

They say Hitler is a maniac who is out to conquer the world. Yet we are told that we must conquer the world and police it.

The one unaltering fact that stands out is that our war leaders are out to destroy Hitler at any cost. However, the reasons they give for destroying Hitler are certainly false.

Could it be that these men would make the world safe for the internationalists?

Could it be that these advisers, instead of following Germany's course of organizing to combat Communism, would follow an equally bloody course of joining Communism to destroy Naziism?

It could be that this little *clique* would like to rule the world themselves.

If the American people will only use a little intelligence in these matters, I doubt if they would want any part in making the United States an imperialistic or Communistic State.

*Detroit, Michigan.* — **F.X.S.**

## What's Wrong With This Picture?

YOU'RE GOING IN, WHETHER YOU LIKE IT, OR NOT!
A NATION OF 130 MILLION FREE AMERICANS
ONE MAN
ROOSEVELT-CHURCHILL-STALIN WAR AGREEMENT
OK!

*— From the Chicago Tribune*

## God Bless Fr. Coughlin

TO THE EDITOR:

As a child I often found my family sitting about the radio listening to the remarks of a great man. Sprawled out on the parlor floor, I found myself wondering what this man could be saying that held the interest of the whole family so intensely.

As time went on, I found myself beginning to understand and love this beloved character, whose voice each Sunday brought incredible truths to the unsuspecting people of a great nation.

I began to realize that he was speaking for me as well as millions of other American boys, by exposing those elements and persons to the American people that are most dangerous to the American way of life.

He spoke that we might continue to live in the peace and security of a free land and that our children's children might also do so.

In time to come, if I am blessed with children of my own, they shall know this man as one of the greatest defenders of American democracy since the birth of our nation.

God bless Father Coughlin!

— **A High School Student.**

*Cromwell, Conn.*

## Alabama Lindbergh

TO THE EDITOR:

Here is how it was advertised: "10:15 p.m., WABC, Address by August F. Lindbergh, 'What's Wrong With the Isolationists?'" Incidentally, the program was arranged by the *Fight for Freedom* gang.

This organization surely tried to put one over on the American public once again by advertising the above broadcast in this manner. The announcement would naturally make us all think that the popular "Lone Eagle" was about to speak.

I am glad I listened in. Never have I heard a more stupid accusation against two outstanding advocates of America First. The Alabama man's thrusts at Wheeler and Lindbergh (the Lone Eagle) did not strike home. His slurring reference to the Republican Party and these two real Americans, by referring to them as "traitors" and "operators for Hitler," and asking the Government to stop their talks, also to curb the Republican members of Congress from speaking their minds, shows to what extremes this *Fight for Freedom* is prepared to go to totalitarianize our form of government.

This radio "Lindbergh" speaks for the South, so he claims; and states that they are behind the President right or wrong. That they (the South) are not going to "cause disunity in a time of crisis." He accuses Senator Wheeler and Col. Lindbergh and the Republican Party of "causing disunity."

Now, we all know the history of the South. In the Civil War this Mr. Lindbergh's Alabama went against a President and also sought England's aid in splitting the United States. What about this "Lindbergh's" beloved South still holding a grudge against the Republican Party?

*Bronx, N. Y.* — **F.E.M.**

# Letters

## Why Do They Want Communism?

TO THE EDITOR:

I always enjoy reading SOCIAL JUSTICE. I get real information and "true facts" of the doings of these times.

I am glad you are explaining in plain language who is driving us into this war, which is not our war; and who are the people who are driving us into Communism.

When Father Coughlin criticized Communists and the international bankers in his radio speeches, I was in the dark as to who "these people" were for the last several years.

Till this war broke out, I could not conceive that the poor, illiterate "Russians" with no funds could get the world interested in Communism.

I commend you for printing plainly, so that all laymen can understand, who is pushing us into this foreign war.

It would be interesting and educational if you could tell us why these people want Communism.

Is it because they would have more security for themselves?

Do they get richer? If they cannot get richer, then their higher education would seem to be for naught.

Under Communism do they get all the better positions of the State?

Can they control the world better than with their money system?

I think it would make a very interesting article for SOCIAL JUSTICE why people want Communism.

—W.K.

*Conshohocken, Pa.*

## 'Another Link'

TO THE EDITOR:

The appointment of Samuel Rosenman to the high position he now occupies — and to whom even F.D.R. is subordinate — represents the latest link in a chain which began during the American Revolution when the broker and loan shark, Haym Saloman, secured his people's place in American affairs.

The Civil War was a battle between Lincoln and the Rothschilds, although the facts have been all but suppressed. England, who gave all aid to the Confederacy short of war, was merely playing her age-old role of fronting for the internationalists.

Historians have frequently used the term "British Israel" in referring to the mighty empire which has for centuries been nothing less than a clearing house for international finance.

John Wilkes Boothe, Lincoln's assassin, whose mother was a Jewess, was not the fanatic some historians would have us believe. Boothe was a paid agent of the Rothschilds.

In fact, at that very time the stuffed shirts in Mayfair were calling President Lincoln "a hairy ape" and looked upon Boothe as no less than a hero. The landed gentry of Britain hated the Great Emancipator for defying the international bankers and freeing the slaves, whose sweat meant more gold for the coffers of the Rothschilds.

William Jennings Bryan, one of the international bankers' most articulate foes, was smeared and ridiculed from pillar to post for his "free silver" campaigns. Much the same as is Father Coughlin persecuted today for fighting the same evil.

The people are to be kept in confusion and ignorance of the rotten, corrupt money system pursued by these British-American overlords and you can be sure that anyone who attempts to tell the real facts about economics and finance will feel the wrath of the B'nai B'rith, the Jewish General Council, and the assorted instruments of the "hidden hand."

—F. McG.

*Louisville, Ky.*

## Objective News on Germany Difficult to Obtain

TO THE EDITOR:

Father Gillis in a recent editorial in the *Catholic World* put it up to the consciences of those Catholics who spread inflammatory propaganda—true or false—against Germany whether or not they intend to bring on war for this country. If they do, he says, it is simple honesty to say so openly.

Every Catholic should realize that every time he hears of a Nazi "atrocity" it is because some influential war monger *wants* him to hear it. If it be true, it is exaggerated; if it be false, it is given verisimilitude. On the other hand, every bit of news that can mitigate hatred is suppressed.

The religious press has lately given wide publicity to stories of wholesale "mercy murders" within the Reich. But *Zeit im Querschnitt*, a sort of combination news weekly and readers' digest published in Berlin — which I receive as often as the patriotic fervor of American and British censors lags — I recently read an article selected from a Munich periodical which condemned categorically all executions without guilt.

The fact that a journal, corresponding to our *Time*, can deem worthy of re-publication an article condemning the moral grounds of a Nazi action proves that paganism in Germany may not be so rampant as it is "patriotic" to believe.

Moreover, in two years I have hardly found an article in *Zeit im Querschnitt* which attacked the Catholic church or Christian belief. Can this journal's counterparts in America — *Time, Newsweek*, or the *Readers' Digest* — boast a like freedom from bigotry?

Incidentally, it seems to me that this German magazine treats foreign events far more dispassionately than do our "objective" weeklies.

If any periodical in the United States can give us *objective* news from Germany, it ought to be the German Catholic weeklies; yet I have found that these papers, for fear no doubt of anti-German discrimination, have adopted a *Commonweal* line in their editorials.

So beware of self-professed "dispassionate," "authentic" news reports from Germany!

This is not by any means an attempt to insinuate a "pro-Nazi" attitude to the readers of SOCIAL JUSTICE. Badly as the Nazi anti-religionism has been exaggerated, it is bad enough.

But, I repeat, you simply hear about Nazi intolerance *because* your internationalist, war-mongering leaders *want* you to hear of it. Nazi anti-religion — true or false — will provide the fuel to keep their war going; though Nazi anti-religion never once entered into the motives for this war.

Talk anti-Sovietism as much as you will, you will bring the United States no inch nearer to involvement. Only anti-Naziism can do that.

*Denver, Colorado.* —P.H.

## 'Union Now' Movement Called 'Treasonable Betrayal'

TO THE EDITOR:

Few persons, comparatively, are actually aware of the utter viciousness of the "Union Now" movement, the extent to which it already has developed, and worst of all, the following which it has among our highest Government officials and their advisors.

If these facts were more widely understood, the American people would immediately rise in wrath to scour every bureaucratic corner and thrice-sift every politician.

At his death in 1902, the wealthy English diamond king, Cecil Rhodes, established by will the Rhodes Scholarship Fund, the purpose of which was to educate at Oxford promising Americans and Britons who would dedicate their lives to the work of bringing, first America, then other lands, into the great British Empire. The dream of Cecil Rhodes was the ultimate domination of the whole world by Britain.

Among contemporary Rhodes scholars is Clarence Streit, author of the notorious books, *"Union Now"* and *"Union Now With Britain,"* and founder of Federal Union Inc., an organization to promote the plan of union with the empire.

This organization boasts of 93 chapters, of distributing 1½-million pieces of literature, and of extensive publicity through widely read periodicals (*Readers' Digest, Liberty, Look* and *Screen Life*) via the radio and newspapers, and even through the "Book of the Month Club," which will give away from 150,000 to 200,000 copies of each of Streit's two *"Union Now"* books in September and October.

The *Congressional Record* (Aug. 12, p. A4160) reveals to the amazement of Americans how Streit's *"Union Now"* is "recommended reading for new officers by the General Staff of the United States Army in a list of recent and standard works. *(U. S. War Department Training Circular No. 25)."*

According to the literature of Federal Union, Inc., the results of "the plan" would be:

1) Liquidation of our United States Congress in favor of a "World Congress" which would combine representatives of the United States, United Kingdom, and various Dominions of the British Empire;

2) Common citizenship with the British and allegiance, not to the U.S.A., but to the "World Federation" — including common taxation to pay for the war as well as for post-war reconstruction throughout the entire empire;

3) A common war cabinet with F.D.R. and Churchill sitting together — (already Harry Hopkins has sat in on a meeting of the British War Cabinet, July 18);

4) A common military machine, composed of the combined forces of the United States and Britain;

5) American responsibility for the fate and welfare of the approximately 500-million British subjects in all parts of the world;

6) Immediate shooting participation of the United States in the present European war;

7) An A.E.F. to defend any and every part of the British Empire;

8) No separate peace by U.S. or Britain without the consent of the other, any more than New York state could make peace for the whole of the U.S.A.

"Unless we act immediately," warns Rep. Stephen A. Day of Illinois, "and a vigorous protest from all loyal citizens reaches Washington at once, our form of government under the *Constitution* and our American independence will be overthrown, not by a foreign invasion using military force, but by a *treasonable betrayal which is already in the making.*"

*Brooklyn, N. Y.* —C.R.M.

## Christian Lives

TO THE EDITOR:

I firmly believe that if we all were to *live a better Christian life* we would not now be experiencing this "Dante's Inferno."

Are we not partaking of the forbidden fruit of modern emotionalism?

Are we not neglecting to inject into our American homes Christian philosophy, which spells harmony for all?

Have we not strayed from our homes, to partaking of the alluring evils that run rampant in our modern society?

War is the price men must always pay for their neglect in leading Christian lives.

Christ has shown us the way for harmony and peace among men, today as of yesterday, by our very actions we spit upon Him and cry out:

*"Crucify Him, give us Barabbas!"*

*Detroit, Michigan.* —E.E.M.

# Comment

## La Follette Presents Case of Wage Earner

(Continued from Page 9)

Under present law, he said, a single person with a $1,000 income pays $4.40. But the *Finance Committee bill* brings that tax up to $21, or an increase of $16.60 — a percentage increase of 337 per cent!

"The present tax on a $3,000 income of a married person is $30.80. The *Finance Committee bill* would raise that tax to $138. This is an increase of $107.20 or 348 per cent. The increase in rates accounts for $57.70, or 187 per cent, and the lowered exemption accounts for $49.50, or 161 per cent."

In contrast, he showed later, how some large corporations are making huge profits but escape taxation under the excess profits law by virtue of the invested-capital method of computing tax liability.

Corporations may use either that method or the average-earnings method.

Mr. La Follette asserted that United States Steel Corporation in 1940 had excess earnings of $96-million over its 1936-39 average; but because of the high capitalization of the corporation it has no excess profits liability under present law.

Another case cited was the American Woolen Company, which showed an average deficit of $320,000 for the period 1936-39, but in 1940 had earnings of $4,280,000 in excess of that deficit period. Still the firm was exempt from excess profits tax.

Likewise, the American Car and Foundry Company, with average earnings of $260,000 from 1936-39. Its excess of earnings in 1940 over the 1936-39 average was $6,320,000 but its excess profits tax liability was nothing.

Senator La Follette must be applauded for his presentation of the case of the small wage earner, who is bearing the brunt of taxation imposed by the most extravagant Administration in the history of America.

But there is little, if any, hope that his efforts will bring relief.

Instead, the burden of taxation will become heavier as interventionists in and out of the New Deal continue to advance their fantastic, impossible plans to finance and police the world with American money and American men.

As we march onward toward war the American taxpayer will be made to realize, more so than he has ever imagined, that *wars are made by those who rule, but are fought and paid for by those who toil.*

---

## Mr. Sabath's Democracy

WELL, here we are again, folks, with another delightful little quotation from Congressman Adolph J. Sabath of Illinois, who moans for closer friendship between the United States and Soviet Russia because, as he maintains, the Soviet has "granted and guaranteed freedom of religious worship," whereas Germany is a nation of pagans.

Another of his brilliant observations was that Communism is disliked by Nazis and American economic royalists, but nevertheless a great deal of the dirty work attributed to Communists in this country has been done by Nazis who put the blame on the Reds in an effort to cloak their own scheming and discredit Communism.

Such are the sentiments of the New Deal's representative from Chicago, who always speaks glowingly of the virtues of democracy, not only in the United States but also throughout the world.

But, apparently, Mr. Sabath really believes there is a time and place for everything — including democracy — and that in certain circumstances involving himself and important national issues, democracy had best be ash-canned.

According to the *Chicago Tribune*, delegations from the *America First Committee* and *We the Mothers Mobilize for America* called upon Mr. Sabath recently and put this question to him:

"Would you vote to approve issues of foreign policy even though your constituents declared their opposition in letters and cards mailed to you?"

Mr. Sabath, that ardent lover of democracy, evaded a direct reply, declaring that he was better informed than his constituents.

"I will take your wishes into consideration, but I must decide on conditions as I see them and as the evidence shows," he said. "I feel *I am better informed on these questions than the average man who takes his information from the newspapers* and societies."

The *Chicago Tribune* reported that Sabath refused to tell the delegations why he had voted for extension of the army draft or whether he approved the President's making a treaty with a foreign power.

Yes, indeed, Mr. Sabath is passionately devoted to democracy, providing the people agree with him.

---

## That's What We Told 'em!

DESPITE the ruinous character of the New Deal's fiscal policies they are of necessity supported by the banks of the nation.

Why? Here's the answer — from a bulletin published by an investment firm specializing in Government securities:

"As of June 30, New York City banks indicated that about 19 per cent of their deposits were in loans, about 37 per cent in Government securities, and the balance of about 40 per cent represented cash.

"Manifestly if such a ratio existed throughout the country, *income from Government security holdings would be essential to meet operating costs and dividends. Banks, in general, cannot afford to reduce their holdings. The whole banking structure is relied upon also for further co-operation in the Government's financial needs, regardless of the Administration's policies.*"

## New Order of Social Justice

NEW DEALERS and Nazis do not have the only "new order."

The sixteen principles of Social Justice, based upon Pius XI's *"Reconstruction of the Social Order,"* and Leo XIII's encyclical *"On the Condition of Labor,"* form a social charter for a Christian State.

In the era of post-war reconstruction, whatever is left of Mr. Roosevelt's New Deal or Mr. Hitler's New Order will have to incorporate these principles of Christian justice before there can be peace in the world.

A discussion of them as applied to wartime England is quoted from the *London Catholic Herald* on Page 7.

---

## Will You Do It?

REMEMBER . . . way back when. No, you weren't a toddler . . . but a gay and over-confident high school student. You weren't "in the swing" unless you wore your sweaters inside out. You had more "on the ball" than the others who took their civics seriously, if you could make the loudest noise scuffing your feet as you walked down the corridors to class. And anyway . . . you just had to sign up for civics because another credit was necessary.

As you reminisce . . . you don't remember much about the course . . . have hazy recollections of words such as *"Referendum"* and *"Recall"* . . . but you do remember how awed you were by the magnitude of the various legislative bodies.

You remember well how the teacher impressed upon the class the superiority of our representative form of Government in which, unlike those of European countries all citizens have a voice.

You remember also, as you finished your text book—after *"L'Envoi,"* the author had a short chapter with something to the effect that our governmental set-up was far from perfect.

"Perfection," he said, never would be achieved unless we all continued to be opinionated at all times.

Remember — you made a firm resolution to do your part.

* * *

You, alone, have not slipped, but a majority of the students of those long ago high school days are rather hazy on these matters.

Resolutions are soon forgotten when they are of such a nature. Fads and fashions of the day have overshadowed the big and important events—just as they did back in school.

So little effort is asked of you now to be a crusader again.

As a reader you already know the fundamental soundness of our views.

Why not take it upon yourself to sow the seed of Social Justice upon the new untilled field of persons who do not know of our existence as yet?

If you enlist and see that five persons read SOCIAL JUSTICE each week — and after they are educated they in turn enlist five others—you know your arithmetic.

A post card to *Social Justice Publishing Company, Royal Oak, Michigan,* is all you need send. Detailed information will be mailed you immediately.

# Comment

## Mr. George Seldes Plays It Both Ways

GEORGE SELDES is one of those diligent ultra liberal journalists who happen to be right about many things and woefully wrong about many more.

He publishes a 4-page, 8½x11" weekly news letter called *In Fact*, which rails against such diversified evils — some real and some imaginary—as J. Edgar Hoover's Fascist G Men, Hitlerism, the persecution of Harry Bridges, newspaper suppression of news unfavorable to heavy advertisers, William Randolph Hearst's tie-up with Hitler, anti-Semitism, exploitation of the poor, Tammany Hall, "Coughlinism" and the Christian Front.

We may have missed a few issues, but we have yet to see any forthright opposition to Communism or Soviet Russia expressed in the pages of the fearless Mr. Seldes' publication, which purports to print inside stuff that daily newspapers suppress for reasons usually economic.

In its September 8, 1941, issue *In Fact*, the intrepid opponent of anti-Semitism, indulges in a few snide cracks about the Catholic Church in New York and in the process becomes entangled in a home-made contradiction.

Discussing the coming mayoralty contest in New York, Mr. Seldes—who is listed in *Who's Who in American Jewry*—reports that "all the native Fascist elements (notably Tammany, the corrupt political machine, Christian Front, Nazi Bund, at least a part of America First, and the Hearst press) have lined up behind the Tammany candidate O'Dwyer for mayor.

"The importance of this election is that it has a national significance. The national organizations on the Fascist side are the Coughlinite Christian Front and America First."

* * *

Further on Seldes, quoting the *New Republic*, takes up the subject of the Catholic Church in politics, implying that it is a partner-in-crime with Tammany, whose " 'only real purpose is to steal, which it used to do at the rate of $1-million a day.

" 'That purpose,' " continues *In Fact*, still quoting the *New Republic*, " 'hardly warrants its continued existence. In New York, Tammany is practically co-extensive with the Catholic Church, which suggests that the responsible leaders of the Church ought to think seriously about repudiating the Wigwam.

" 'Quite apart from the ethical questions involved, the outstanding fact about the Church hierarchy during its whole career has been that it has never stayed very long on the losing side in any struggle. Tammany is the losing side; what can the Church hierarchy possibly hope to gain from going on that would counterbalance the losses it incurs?' However, since then the Power House has never repudiated the Tammany Wigwam.

"The mere fact that the term 'Power House' is common in inside political circles points to the fact that the Church hierarchy is considered a power in politics. The power house is 477 Madison Avenue, the chancery office of the Church, and by the Power House the politicians mean the power of the Cardinal or the Archbishop who directs the diocese from that address. Today the reference is to Archbishop Spellman.

"Spellman is the cleric chosen by the late Pope to smuggle out his encyclical against Mussolini's Fascism. Spellman is an anti-Fascist. Incidentally, it is interesting to note that the Brooklyn diocese is not only larger than that of N.Y.C. but is the largest in the world. It is completely dominated by pro-Fascist (therefore anti-Spellman) priests and politicians, mostly Tammany men."

* * *

After that beautiful tribute to the Catholic Church, its priests, its hierarchy and its lay members, the Jewish Mr. Seldes returns to the subject of O'Dwyer's candidacy.

Recall that he earlier had stated that "all the native Fascist elements," including the "Coughlinite" Christian Front had lined up behind O'Dwyer.

Nevertheless, he states that "O'Dwyer says he is a hater of anti-Semitism, of Coughlin, of the Christian Front, of political preachers of all creeds, of reaction, of all forms of Fascism and notably of the Christian Front. This statement is made on the basis of an evening spent with O'Dwyer at the home of a noted N.Y.C. liberal (and Jewish) lawyer.

"Everyone who knows O'Dwyer believes him to be the enemy of Coughlin, the Christian Front, Hearst, Tammany, the Bund and in fact every element and person now joined in the native-Fascist pro-Tammany O'Dwyer mayoralty campaign."

Seldes calls upon O'Dwyer not to "straddle the issue" but to denounce publicly the Christian Fronters, "Coughlinites" etc.

We should like to have Editor Seldes explain several points of his learned discourse, namely: why would Christian Fronters and "Coughlinites" rally behind O'Dwyer if they believed him to be their enemy?

If Tammany is one of the "native Fascist elements" and if Archbishop Spellman is anti-Fascist, what about that "power house" control of the Archbishop in N. Y. politics?

Just what is intent of the remark that the Church "has never stayed very long on the losing side in any struggle"?

What is a "native Fascist"?

As a Jew labeling the largest Catholic diocese in the world as "Fascist," is Mr. Seldes winning support from Catholics in any fight against anti-Semitism?

---

## Note to Committee Investigating Movies

THE *Detroit Jewish Chronicle* (Sept. 5, 1941), prints a "Washington Letter" by one Milton Persitz, which virtually admits that the movie moguls have made a few ventures "into the deep waters of anti-Nazi propaganda."

Judging from the article, it would seem that they are more perturbed about taxation than any pending investigation. The article is reprinted:

*"Hollywood in Fighting Mood*

"The film producers in Hollywood are seething. First they were accused of warmongering. Now, Congress adds a burden even harder to bear: new taxes on amusements. Hollywood has learned to grit its teeth and smile broadly, but the dentists' bills on the West Coast are likely to go skyrocketing soon.

"The new imposts mean that if you've been paying 40 cents for your movie tickets, plus 4 cents' tax, you'll shortly be forking over a total of 46 cents. And if you are the patron of those movie houses which charge 75 cents and more, your bill will go up proportionately. For the tax, which is expected to raise more than $72-million, is being upped from 10 per cent to 15.

"There are always two ways to take care of these charges. The movie people may cut their admissions and thus absorb part of the bill, or they can simply sock the customer for the full amount. The latter procedure has been used so often as to set a precedent. But it is not likely that Hollywood will stand still and take all this pasting in the spirit of good clean national defense.

* * *

"The movie men have much to be angry about. When they relaxed in the Will Hays cuckoo-land of fantasy, they were called 'escapists,' lily-livered, to boot. When they made—experimentally, of course—a few ventures into the deep waters of anti-Nazi propaganda, they were called war makers by Nye and Wheeler. Now the Government looks benignly upon the purveyors of America's entertainment, and says:

" 'We frankly don't care what you produce. You can sell the public stories about romance in Tahiti or the perils of Fredric March the refugee, but whatever you make will be taxed just a little more. If the public is willing to spend a quarter on your shows, it will spend 29 cents.'

"There was a minor revolt in the film capital when Senator Clark's committee 'invited' some leaders to testify on their recent output. A few said flatly that they would sooner see Clark and his ilk in —, but that was straightened out through some adroit public relations. Now here's something which hits everyone equally. We shall see how the principles of Americanism which Hollywood has long championed can be made to tie in with the right of theatregoers to see a movie without giving up their shirts in the bargain."

* * *

We wonder who called the movie leaders 'lily-livered' when they were hesitant about producing propaganda pictures. Certainly, it was not the great bulk of the peace-loving American people. Maybe it was the refugees, or more logical yet, the Eastern war-minded bankers who demanded the stuff and promised the movie bigshots immunity.

The Senate investigation should be a great show with Vendell Villkie (just "campaign oratory,") as counsel for the movie moguls.

NATIONAL WEEKLY
Social Justice
Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

# What Good Result in Two Years of War?

**NOW THAT** the nations at war have been locked in their titanic struggle for two years, what have they accomplished?

Have the Germans proved by their conquest of Poland that they were *right* and Poland was *wrong*?

Who can remember precisely what the German-Polish dispute was about?

There was something about Danzig, the Free State, the Corridor and East Prussia; but does not the original point at issue, whatever it was, seem microscopic in comparison with the enormous expenditure in money and in human lives already made by both sides?

Have the Allies proven Naziism and Fascism to be wrong?

Have the Axis powers disproven the democratic theory by their conquest of France and their over-running of the other countries of Europe?

If Soviet Russia, with the help of Britain and the United States, should triumph over Germany, would that demonstrate that Communism is *the better way of life*, and that Europe, and America, should, therefore, be Bolshevized?

*What single good result has emerged from these two years of bloodshed, slaughter, and unparalleled destruction?*

* * *

These questions were propounded by the Rev. John A. O'Brien, Ph.D., of the University of Notre Dame in a recent coast-to-coast broadcast over the Mutual network.

"I am asking my fellow countrymen to build an impregnable defense for America and *to choose the road to peace,*" said Father O'Brien. America, he said, stands at the cross roads, facing the road to war, and the road to peace.

If we look at the matter calmly, not through the eyes of emotion but through the eyes of reason, we shall be obliged to say:

*"All this orgy of killing and destruction has yielded not one single good result."*

It has decided no question of justice or right.

It has decided merely which side has the more effective military machine and more human fodder to feed it.

Hundreds of cities have been laid waste. Thousands of works of art, culture and civilization have been destroyed.

Hundreds of thousands of human families have been uprooted and their members scattered far and wide. Millions of men, women and children have been slaughtered like cattle.

A whole civilization is in flames.

Who are the victors? *Lunacy, destruction and death!*

The whole stupid, brutal business of seeing which side could destroy the most property, and kill the largest number of human beings, has pulled Europe back into the caveman stage where might is the only right.

* * *

If America should enter the fray, and the war should last for five or ten years, what would the result be?

Even if we sent 10 or 12-million fighting men, the conquest of an Axis-dominated Europe would still be problematical.

Let us suppose, however, that by some circumstance not immediately apparent, we should succeed after ten years in ekeing out a military victory. What would we have gained?

Europe would be a shambles — a desert. Ten to 20-million men would be killed. Centuries of civilization would be in ruins. Disease, famine and death would stalk the land.

Our own country would be completely bankrupt. The debt would weigh like a millstone on the neck of generations yet unborn. A military bureaucracy would regiment our every act. The flower of our manhood would be slain. Every home would be in mourning.

And, who would the victors be? Again, lunacy, destruction, death!

What good would have been achieved?

Would we not have crushed Hitlerism, Naziism, Fascism?

* * *

We might have slaughtered millions of Germans and millions of Italians, but we would not have crushed these ideologies.

Ideas are impervious to destruction by tanks, guns and bombs. They can be conquered only by other ideas, assimilated through the free play of the mind.

Reason, education and discussion are the only means by which we can purge the human mind of falsehood and secure the reign of Truth.

The whole argument calling for America to enter the European strife, to crush Naziism and Fascism is vitiated by a fundamental fallacy — the naive assumption that *ideas* can be destroyed by arms and warfare.

Instead of dislodging those ideas, force will only drive them deeper!

Only by the sword of the mind, functioning freely in peace, can we slay the dragon of totalitarian ideology.

## Encyclical 'Rerum Novarum' Provides Social Charter for a 'New Order'